The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1892.

The Week.

THE *Times's* correspondent at Washington, whose war with Chili has shown signs of slackening lately, made a reconnoissance in force on New Year's eve, with somewhat brilliant results. He found that an order had been issued for the shipment of 45,000 pounds of powder to San Francisco for big guns. Moreover, this powder was to go "from the Dupont Powder Works direct"—a fact which implied haste. At all events, the blatherskite who prepared the headlines understood it so, for he labelled it "Hurrying Powder West." Is it customary, when ordering the Dupont Company's powder to San Francisco, to send it by the roundabout road instead of sending it direct? The Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department ought to look into this matter. At the same time that the shipment of powder direct was going on, there was a shipment of 2,200 pounds of gun-cotton from Newport to San Francisco. "These shipments," says the blatherskite, "following close upon the large shipments of powder a few days ago, cannot be explained on the ground that they are merely to replenish the stores depleted by target practice, for it is known that every vessel on the Pacific station has already a full supply of powder and projectiles, and the present shipments are, in fact, intended to form a reserve supply, to be drawn upon in case of hostilities." This bustle with powder and gun-cotton took place, he tells us, on a day of "holiday calm" at the Navy Department, a day on which "there was less talk than for some weeks about preparations for war." What, in Heaven's name, then, might happen on a day of ordinary ferocity at the Navy Department?

In the book just published by the man who was the London *Times's* correspondent in Chili until recalled for his ridiculous infatuation with Balmaceda, there are two passages bearing upon the question of American neutrality. The first is:

> "I went on to have a look at the American cruiser *Baltimore*, which had recently arrived. I found the officers, from the Captain downwards, very distinctly partisans of the Government. They regarded the alleged causes of the revolution as mere flimsy pretexts, and believed that the whole affair had been worked up by agitators on behalf of the European nitrate syndicates."

The other reads:

> "The Americans had heretofore stood well-nigh alone in evincing sympathy with the cause of the President. . . . They had, indeed, been almost as avowedly partisans of Balmaceda as the British war-ships had been of Congress; and had they been represented by any other living man than Mr. Patrick Egan, as Resident Minister, their moral support would have carried far more weight than it did."

The correspondent himself was a hot friend of Balmaceda's, and knew at least when he found a fellow-feeling, however untrustworthy his book may be in other particulars.

The discharge of more than 200 workmen from the Government service at Sandy Hook, without payment of their wages for two months' work already done, points to financial straits at Washington. According to the newspaper accounts, every sort of excuse for withholding the pay of these men has been resorted to. "Red tape" is made responsible by some people, while the workmen themselves are imbued with the notion that the money appropriated by Congress to pay them has been "diverted to politics." Red tape means simply the formality prescribed by law or regulation for drawing money from the Treasury. It is not hurtful nor even dilatory when the money is on hand to pay the bills as they become due. But if the money is not there, then red tape becomes very helpful to the delinquent debtor. It enables him to push ahead the claims that are least pressing in order to meet those that are most pressing. In such cases forms become very important. It is to be remarked that red tape has not given much trouble in this particular since the close of the war, although it was complained of more or less during the war, particularly in reference to the pay of the soldiers. The reason why obligations of the Government have been promptly paid heretofore is that the Treasury has had the money to pay them. If red tape multiplies now, the presumption is that the bottom of the Treasury is in sight, and that the Secretary is holding back every dollar that he can. We know of one case where the rent of a building hired by the Government, although due and payable monthly, has not been paid for four months. We hope that the claimants, whether stone-cutters or others, will make their wrongs known to their respective members of Congress. Let us have an early investigation in order to learn what the Government owes—what is the amount of its honest debts that it cannot pay. Then let us have a temporary loan bill to clear them off, accompanied by a tax bill to pay the loan.

Mr. McKinley's letter to Mr. Blaine, acquitting the latter of having desired to put a duty on hides, may have an important bearing on Cabinet dissensions at the present time, and may add to the number of Mr. Blaine's New England delegates in the next Republican Convention; but as settling what he actually did want, or say he wanted, in respect to hides, it is of slight value. He doubtless was on record on both sides, as usual, particularly on the side that came out ahead. It is not known what he told the Republican members on the 10th of February, 1890, when he made the visit to them which they took such pains to keep secret, but which he revealed to the public through his man, Mr. W. E. Curtis. But whatever may have been the case at that time, it is certain that he is now explicitly committed to a tax on hides. He has over and over again expressed his approval of the Aldrich amendment, which authorizes the President to lay a tax on hides after January 1. Moreover, Mr. Blaine's own proposition was to tax "all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere"—including hides, of course—unless those nations would admit free to their ports a specified list of our exports. This was his suggestion in his letter to the President of June 4, laid before the Senate on June 19.

There has been a great deal of falsehood about Mr. Blaine's attitude towards the Aldrich amendment, as a plain statement of the facts will show. As we just said, Mr. Blaine's letter embodying his own views was transmitted by the President to the Senate on June 19. Immediately after its reading, Senator Hale offered an amendment to the Tariff Bill couched in almost the exact language used by Mr. Blaine in his letter, so that the *Tribune* said that "his [Mr. Blaine's] proposition" was brought before the Senate by Mr. Hale. Referred to the Committee on Finance, it came out on August 28 in the totally different shape of the Aldrich amendment. Was Mr. Blaine satisfied with that shape? Not at all; and so he got Senator Hale to urge his amendment again on September 2. Even after the Senate had defeated that Blaine measure and adopted the Aldrich plan, it was uncertain how the Secretary stood until his letter to Editor Clapp of September 15, in which he characteristically claimed the whole result as his own. Thereupon the faithful *Tribune* heaved a sigh of relief, and said the letter showed that "Mr. Blaine accepts the Aldrich amendment, and the Republican party will be united." As if this legerdemain were not enough, Mr. Blaine indulged in the following bit of tergiversation. He wrote to Editor Clapp: "Every free-trader in the Senate voted against the reciprocity provision." Now, it is an historical fact that Senator Gray offered Blaine's own amendment, in Blaine's own words, with the exception that he said "the President . . . is directed," instead of "authorized," and that every Democrat in the Senate voted for it, while every Republican voted against it.

The Omaha *Bee* publishes an interview with Senator Carlisle on a variety of topics

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of national interest. Being asked whether he considered Mr. Blaine or Mr. Harrison the stronger candidate in a Presidential campaign, he replied that he considered Mr. Harrison the stronger. Upon this point he said:

"The nomination of Mr. Blaine might create more enthusiasm than the nomination of Mr. Harrison, but I do not believe he would get as many votes as Mr. Harrison. Many of the conservative business men of the Republican party are afraid of the erratic elements of Mr. Blaine's nature, which have led him at times to imprudent acts and speeches on public matters. Blaine is a remarkable man as a party leader, and he has been compared by some to Henry Clay. His legislative career has been much like that of Mr. Clay. Clay was one of the greatest partisan leaders of his time, but you can find upon our statute-books no act of great value which originated with him. His greatest speeches have passed away, and his reputation is more of a tradition than anything else. Still, for half a century almost he was the leader of a great party and the idol of the people."

Statistics will sustain Mr. Carlisle's views on this subject, whether the comparison be made with the vote for Garfield before Blaine was nominated, or with the vote for Harrison afterwards. If Mr. Blaine is nominated this year, he will be strongest on the day of his nomination. There will be "storms of applause" in the convention-hall, a thundering of cannon out-of-doors, a tremendous fizzing of Roman candles, serpents, wheels, and other pyrotechnics in the evening, and from that time forward to the election a slow but steady loss of votes.

Ex-Gov. Hill signalized his retirement from office at Albany by making a speech explanatory of his Elmira speech. He complained that no Republican or Mugwump paper had published his Elmira speech, while all had denounced it with misrepresentations which the text of it would have exposed. We do not recall any complaint like this from any public man who uses good English. Nor do we recall any other case where a second speech was necessary within two weeks to explain the first one. If Mr. Hill's Elmira speech was misrepresented, it was because it was composed in an involved and foggy diction, signs of which are abundant also in the Albany speech. His twofold modest attempt to signalize his belated entry into the United States Senate by mapping out a tariff and currency programme for the Democratic party in the nation, does not appear to have commanded enthusiastic approval in the press of his own party. Three Democratic journals, all of prominence in the party, have repudiated his suggestions without much ceremony. One of these, the *World* of this city, has been Mr. Hill's most unswerving defender during the closing months of his career as Governor, and its disapproval is therefore of considerable significance. It says that Mr. Hill's programme "is not one that ought to commend itself to Congress," and that "it would commit the party to doctrines and policies which the party has condemned, and upon its condemnation of which the great victory of 1890 was won." The Buffalo *Courier* is no less emphatic, declaring it "amazing that Gov. Hill should seriously seek to commit the Democratic party to a policy that would kill its hopes of success this year dead as a door-nail," and pronouncing his tariff programme "distinctly reactionary," with a tendency to confuse and embarrass the issue and put the Democratic party on the defensive. The Indianapolis *Sentinel*, which is one of the highest authorities in the Democratic party in the West, likewise makes short work of Mr. Hill's "programme of cowardice, dishonesty, and partisan imbecility."

We think it will be entirely safe, in view of these utterances, to leave to the Democratic party of the nation the task of disposing of Mr. Hill's claims to be its economic guide and teacher. No opponent of the Senator and his kind of politics can wish for anything better calculated to injure him in the estimation of his own party than the two speeches in which he has made his first appearance as a national leader. He has revealed his mental and moral equipment much more clearly and accurately in them than his critics have been able to do in years of analysis. The more those speeches are examined, the worse will be the light in which Mr. Hill will stand. We find, for example, in the Ithaca *Democrat*, an analysis of one statement in the first speech, contributed by Prof. J. Laurence Laughlin of Cornell University, which shows the slender equipment that Mr. Hill had upon which to set himself up as an authority on the silver question. He asked in his Elmira speech why it was that from 1792 to 1873 silver abided every test, and he answered his own question by asking another: "Did ever free bimetallic coinage, down to 1873, for one hour fail to make the silver dollar equal to the gold dollar, whether at mint or crucible, or in any market in the wide world?" Prof. Laughlin gives a careful historical survey of the experience of the silver dollar in the United States during the period, and comes to the conclusion, fully sustained by citations from the records, that Mr. Hill's question is an "idle" one, since the "silver dollar was often, and for decades, either above or below the gold dollar in value."

The late Senator Plumb is generally admitted to have read aright the sentiment of his party and the people in Kansas, and to have strengthened himself politically by his opposition to the McKinley Bill. His successor, ex-Congressman Perkins, is not a man of the same stamp of independence. Even in the matter of lead-ore imports from Mexico, he allowed party discipline to get the better of the interests of his constituents, although two other Republican Congressmen from Kansas voted for the amendment to admit the ores free of duty for the sake of the smelters in Kansas. On the financial question he adds one more to the list of Western Republican Senators who declare the demonetization of silver to have been "a crime." On the whole, he promises to increase the public regret at the untimely death of his predecessor.

What has become of the expert investigation of the books of the Keystone Bank in Philadelphia? Was it stopped by the election? The last that was heard of it before election was about the middle of September, when the experts were ordered by Secretary Foster to discontinue their labors because the Government appropriation for such work had been exhausted. Soon afterwards the Citizens' Committee of Philadelphia offered to defray the expense of continuing the examination, and the offer was accepted by Mr. Foster. Since that time no sound has come from the experts, so far as we have been able to discover. They said, when they were stopped, that they had just reached the most interesting point of their examination. Have they ever passed it? There was also a local squad of experts engaged in the same work, but we believe that they were called off some time ago. Did the triumph of the Republican party in the election mean that the robbery and ruin of the Keystone Bank were proper proceedings, and that the attempts which were made to find out the responsible persons were all mistakes?

The free-pass question has come before the Inter-State Commerce Commission, which has rendered a decision holding that it is unlawful to grant free transportation to public officers or private citizens on the ground that their good will is important to the corporation. This ground has been advanced as the justification or excuse for granting passes by railroad companies, and it is, of course, the only ground for the policy. When a company charges $5 for transporting an unknown passenger a certain distance, it cannot carry an official or a "prominent citizen" for nothing except on the plea that the latter's good will is important to it and will be secured by the favor. But the Commission holds that such persons can have no rights in this respect over ordinary travellers by reason of their social or official positions, and consequently that it is an unjust discrimination to carry them without payment of usual fare. The Commission, however, does not prohibit the granting of passes to newspaper men, hotel proprietors, or agents of companies doing business with the corporation, taking the position that these classes stand in a different light under the law, and may not unreasonably claim to be rendering a fair return for the favor. It would have been more consistent if the Commission had made a ruling which would cover all cases, as it must often happen that another man in a certain town than a hotel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proprietor or an editor may be as able to render a fair return for a pass, and consequently as well entitled to it in all justice. As regards public officials, there can be no dispute as to the soundness of the decision. It is a reproach to the community that so many men in such a position are ready to use such passes, and the law should be invoked to end the abuse, if nothing else will serve. It is a waste of time to argue that a judge or a legislator is not affected by a pass. Human nature being what it is, he is influenced, consciously or unconsciously. The proof of this is that the railroad managers grant passes to such officials, for they would not do it if they were not convinced that, in the long run, it pays by inclining the officials to take a more favorable view of the corporations than they would hold otherwise. Of course, the Inter-State Commerce Commission has no authority in this matter except over lines which run through more than one State, and action by the Legislatures will be required to put an end to the abuse.

The low price of cotton revives the discussion in the South of schemes to restrict production in future. Alliance lodges say that the farmers should curtail their cotton acreage, and attempts are making to secure the adoption of concerted methods looking to that end. But the great trouble with all such efforts is that every farmer wants other people to do the cutting-down while he keeps on as before, and that 99 out of every 100 are pretty sure to "trust to luck." Indeed, the Mobile *Register* considers all this discussion a waste of time, because nothing will ever come of it. It points out that the population of the South is increasing, and that the production of cotton will naturally keep pace with it; that the use of commercial fertilizers has brought into cultivation vast tracts of land heretofore regarded as valueless; that the pine lands of the South are now more productive than the alluvial lands, because more easily worked, more healthy, cheaper, and less liable to casualties; and that the area of cotton lands has widened in every direction, running up into North Carolina and Mississippi, and covering a new empire in Texas. The real trouble, in the *Register's* opinion, is, not that more cotton is produced than the world could consume, but that there are not proper facilities for converting the raw material into cloth and transporting it to possible buyers. Every year spreads civilization further into the realm of barbarism, and "every savage is learning to wear a shirt." China and Japan will consume an immense quantity of cotton as soon as they can get it cheaply and conveniently. What ought to be done, therefore, is not to attempt the hopeless task of restricting production, but to erect cotton factories all over the South, so as to spin as much cotton as possible at home, and then to "demand of Congress freer trade, so that people of new countries may be induced to exchange their commodities for our cotton."

Again does English law come forward with a decision calculated to develop the bump of caution in publishers. A firm in Sydney issued a subscription work in two volumes, entitled 'Australian Men of Mark.' A certain subscriber declined to take the books, on the ground that his own biography did not appear therein, although the promise had been made him that it should so appear. The publishers brought suit to compel performance of contract, but the Chief Justice of New South Wales, Sir Frederick Darley, threw them out of court. His decision took a wider range than the contention of the defendant that a private understanding had been violated, and was based upon the broad ground that the contents of the book did not correspond to its title. He declared that the biographies it contained were of merely local celebrities, who had no right to be considered as Australian men of mark. In view of this fact, the Chief Justice decided not only that the defendant should be acquitted, but that, in general, all contracts entered into on account of the book were null and void. This certainly adds a new difficulty to the traditional ones of an author in choosing a title for his writings. Of what avail to select a taking name, when it may only result in a prosecution for obtaining money under false pretences? Particularly ominous is this decision for the publishers of such works as 'The Best Books' or 'The Greatest Thing in the World.' A buyer with a different standard of judgment from the author's may hereafter throw such books back on the publishers with a demand for a refund. The principle must apply to sub-titles also, and this suggests the danger of appending "a poem" or "a farce" to an otherwise legally unobjectionable title.

Experiments in agricultural coöperation on a large scale must be exceedingly rare in France, owing to the repeated subdivision of landed property under the operation of the French law of inheritance, and much interest thus attaches to an undertaking of the sort which has been on trial for the past ten years in Brittany. In that province the Comte de Lariboisière is the proprietor of eighty farms, covering some 1,600 hectares (about 4,000 acres). At the time of the severe agricultural depression in 1880, many of his tenants were far behind in their rents, and were abandoning their leases in despair. Thereupon the Count proposed an arrangement by which they were to continue to work the farms under his direction, he to assume all financial responsibility, to guarantee them their living, and to give them the half of all profits derived from their labor. Then he secured a competent manager who proceeded to make a specialty of dairy farming, steadily improving the breed of cows, and perfecting the processes of manufacture of butter and cheese, with the result of soon securing a reputation for superior products and the highest prices in the market. Both owner and farmer have prospered highly under the new plan. From the accounts which have been published in the case of each farm, it appears that the returns have been greatly increased. Thus one farm which used to rent for $454—a sum which the tenant was unable to realize from the year's farming operations—yielded $1,174 in 1886-'87 and $1,710 in 1889-'90. In the last instance the farmer received, besides his living, $613, and the owner, $1,028, while the balance went to hired laborers as their share of the profits.

The Famine Committee in Russia is said to be making serious efforts to relieve the misery of the peasants, 800,000 of whom are to be employed in paving streets in various towns and in the cleansing of rivers. These works, however, it is added, cannot be begun before spring, and in the meantime the Government will grapple in its own fashion with the problem of transporting grain to the afflicted districts. An illustration of the inability of the officials to move supplies even where railroad facilities abound, is the fact that in Odessa alone there are 8,000,000 bushels of grain which might be shipped to the distressed regions in Poland. In Riga, according to a well-informed correspondent of the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 11,000,000 bushels of oats are doomed to rot because no purchaser can be found in the interior of Russia, the Minister of War having refused to buy any before spring, until which time the supply cannot be kept without being damaged. Similar conditions prevail at Libau, Revel, and other Baltic ports. In remoter parts of the empire, as in the Government of Yeniseisk, grain is an absolute drug in the market, and brings only nominal prices, but there, as elsewhere, means of transportation are totally wanting. The few Russian journals which are allowed to speak even a part of the truth paint the situation in dark colors. Thus the *Vyestnik Yevropy*, a conservative monthly, takes to task the "newspaper patriots" who, like the *Novosti* and the *Novoye Vremya*, flatter the national vanity instead of doing penance for national sins. "The entire mismanagement," says the *Vyestnik*, "is thoroughly Russian in its lack of foresight, of unity of action, of calm consideration of necessary measures, as well as in the habit of doing things at hap-hazard and in the lax sense of duty and responsibility on the part of those charged with authority." Moreover, those who are directly answerable for the extent of the famine and who profit by it, the speculators and usurers, says the *Vyestnik*, are not foreigners, but men with genuine Russian names and of orthodox Russian ancestry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES.

THE question of the Speaker's rights and duties seems to have a great fascination for ex-Speaker Reed. He is at it again in the last number of the *North American Review*, in combination with Mr. Mills, the well-known member of Congress. Mr. Mills, however, devotes himself mainly to a defence of the individual member's right to refrain from voting at a division, while Mr. Reed, in spite of his present position in the House as the leader of a small minority, makes a savage attack on the rights of minorities, whom he seems to regard with great contempt. Mr. Mills twits him with his change of front on this matter since 1880, when he joined Mr. Blaine in denouncing the very line of action in the Speaker's chair which he himself followed when occupying that place last winter. But evidently nothing is gained by convicting Mr. Reed of inconsistency. He considers it now the main duty of the politician to get what he wants, and apparently has as much scorn as ex-Senator Ingalls for the man who falters or hesitates about the means.

The gist of his contention in his last article is contained in the following, and criticism of this one passage covers his whole case:

> "Among the most cherished so-called rights of minorities is the right of debate. But is that in any sense a right of minorities as such? What is debate, and what is it for? It is not merely a display of the vocabularies of orators. It is not a sacred privilege of talk for no purpose. It is permitted solely to guide the whole assembly to right conclusions. Men join in debate, when they fulfil honestly its mission, for the purpose of pointing out the advantages of the thing proposed or the objections which exist against it. Debate is intended to throw light on the subject from all directions, so that there may be no delusions arising from the shadows. Now, what is all this for? For the benefit of those who in the result turn out to be the fewer in number? By no manner of means. All this light is thrown, not to enable the minority to prevent conclusions, but to enable the majority to come to right conclusions. It hardly needs more than this statement to show that any right of debate which prevents results by obstruction instead of guiding to correct results by enlightenment, is a perversion of honest purpose which ought to receive condemnation and repression."

It is quite true that debate is, in a legislative body, in theory intended to act on the majority in that body—that is, the party in power—and induce them to change or modify their purposes. But it is also true that even if the purpose of the majority were known, and publicly announced to be unalterable, even if it were as certain as that the sun shines at noon that nothing the minority could say would change a single vote, the right of the minority to talk would, under the immemorial principles and traditions of the Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, remain unshaken. Speaker Reed's theory that the House is not a deliberative but an executive body would make the House a ridiculous body, for a worse organ for the despatch of business could hardly be devised. The "work of the nation," as Mr. Reed looks at it, would be vastly better done by a good bureaucracy presided over by a well-meaning despot like, say, Mr. Reed himself. The reason why talking bodies like the House are tolerated in America and England is, that the Anglo-Saxon race has, from time out of memory, determined to have not military government, but government by *discussion*—that is, government under which all action shall be preceded by a considerable amount of public talk, even if useless or idle talk. It is to this determination that we owe the existence of the American Constitution and those of the several States. Government by discussion has been ridiculed a good deal, but always hitherto by Cæsars and cavalry officers, never until now by the Speaker of a parliamentary body; which shows what an extraordinary thing tariff fanaticism is.

This is not all, however. It is a maxim of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence governing all proceedings, civil and criminal, legislative and judicial, that the other side must be "heard"—that is, that no action shall be taken by one man affecting another man's interests in mind, body, or estate without hearing what he has to say, and hearing it fully. This may be a mere form. It may be well known that nothing that he can say will have any influence on the result, and that his talk will only impede the despatch of business; but his claim to be heard has become imbedded in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, not merely as a personal right, but as an inevitable accompaniment and consequence of the system of government by discussion.

The minority in a legislature, moreover, does not merely talk for itself. It talks as counsel for its constituents out of doors. The minority in the last House of Representatives practically represented—taking the Presidential vote as the test—5,536,242 voters; the majority, led by Mr. Reed, 5,440,708. In other words, the country was about equally divided between the two parties. The line of division in the House was a mechanical or legal, not a moral one. The assumption of the leader of the majority, under these circumstances, to treat the minority with such contempt as to consider their say not worth listening to, was a preposterous one.

It is quite true, however, that debate, even under a government of discussion, must have limits if discussion is not to defeat the object of all government. These limits, too, must be fixed by rules, and the rules must be interpreted and put in force by somebody. That somebody is in all parliamentary countries the speaker or presiding-officer. But this officer must be a *judicial* officer. He must not be a party leader. He must not head either the majority or the minority. He must not be charged with the carriage of party measures. It must be infamous for him to have private or personal interests in pending legislation. The reason of this is that the questions, Has the matter in hand been sufficiently debated? Have the minority been sufficiently heard? Have they had their full rights under law and custom? must come up every day under the rules. To intrust the decision of these questions to their opponents, or to one of their opponents, is a violation of what is, rightly or wrongly, called and popularly accepted as the principles of "natural justice."

Nevertheless, this is what Mr. Reed contends for, and what he actually put in force when he was in the Speaker's chair. He has already described the Speaker as in truth the leader of the majority, charged, just as the Prime Minister is in England, with seeing that such measures as he approves of are put through without what he may consider unnecessary delay. He has repudiated completely for the Speaker the character of a judicial officer charged with the duty of seeing fair play and protecting the rights of the weaker party. Under his rulings, in fact, the presence of a minority in the House is wholly unnecessary, and he might himself now go home to Maine and have his salary sent to him in Portland without fear or reproach. But if his theories were adopted and put in practice for any great length of time by his successors, they would destroy parliamentary government in Washington, and lead to a radical constitutional definition of the Speaker's office, so as to correct his manners and excesses and surround him with judicial proprieties. We trust Mr. Crisp has adopted none of Mr. Reed's fantastic absurdities.

THE IMMIGRATION PROBLEM.

THE opening of a new Congress has revived the discussion of the question of restricting immigration. Among the flood of bills which poured in before the holiday recess was a large number of propositions bearing upon this subject. The feeling has been widespread through the country during the past year that "something ought to be done," and of course Senators and Representatives have been prompt in suggestions as to how it ought to be done.

But it is much easier to propose a "plan" than it will be to secure the enactment of any measure which will essentially change the present situation. A striking illustration of the difficulties of the problem is presented by the experience of New England with a class of immigrants who have been looked upon with the greatest aversion by a large proportion of the people among whom they came. Some years ago the drift of French Canadians across the border grew into a flood, which swept into the manufacturing cities of New England until in some cases this class became the largest element in the foreign-born population. Great was the alarm among the descendants of the original settlers. It was urged that the new comers were ignorant, poor, and degraded; that they would lower the rate of wages and raise the proportion of criminals; that they did not show any disposition to become Americans, but really owed allegiance to another country, while most of them were also in subjection to the priesthood—in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

short, that they constituted a most dangerous class in the community.

Ten years ago a strong element in New England would have been ready to support any measure which promised to arrest what was then considered a most alarming evil. But since then a marked change has come about in the attitude of the public towards these immigrants. Maine has had the longest and fullest experience with them, and a Maine journal, the Bangor *News*, recently made an interesting and valuable summary of the results of this experience. It referred to the fact that the people of Maine, and particularly the old Puritan Yankee families, looked askance upon the "Montreal invasion," as it used to be called, of French Canadians who came to the State to better their condition; that "all sorts of ugly stories were circulated about the new comers when they first began to arrive, and many gloomy presages were made about the outcome of a society into which so much of a foreign nature had been mingled." The *News* proceeds:

"They came and went to work, doing whatever they could find that yielded any pay, and now, after an experience of twenty years or more, these same people who foretold ill are convinced that the French Canadian makes a good citizen and is a valuable addition to the community. He works the year round, and not by jumps and starts. His wages are small, but he saves what he gets, and as early as possible he makes a home for himself, becomes a taxpayer, and helps to support the schools and keep the community prosperous. He believes in education, morality, decency, and progress. He seldom becomes chargeable to the town or city where he lives, and his name is very rare upon the criminal record. Not a politician or an office-seeker, he believes in good government, and casts his vote in favor of economy and reform. As years go on he will grow more and more in favor, his peculiarities will blend with those of the Yankees, and in twenty years more nobody can tell the English stock from the French."

There is probably a somewhat optimistic tone about this judgment, but its substantial truth receives confirmation from a recent deliverance on the same subject in a Montreal newspaper. A certain Abbé Dugas writes a letter to *La Minerve*, in which he protests most earnestly against the emigration of French Canadians to the United States, and his chief reason is that they soon become thoroughly Americanized. Upon this point he says:

"What is the fatality that pushes us towards that great republic where, soon or late, whatever may be said to the contrary, our nationality will be absorbed? Let the generation born in Canada disappear, that generation which still preserves roots in which the sap taken from the old Canadian soil is still running, and you will then see what will be the feelings in the new stems impregnated with the ideas of American progress. The attachment for Canada will vanish by degrees; nothing will be left to call to mind the fatherland, and the descendants of the old Canadian will be Americans purely and simply. One must be very optimistic or very simple to imagine that the generation born and brought up in the United States will preserve deep sympathies for Canada."

Here is a substantial agreement between the Roman Catholic priest of Montreal and the Protestant editor of Maine, that our Canadian immigrants are sure to become good Americans as regards nationality, while the Yankee observer testifies that they also turn out good citizens. In short, while it would perhaps be too hasty a conclusion to assume that New England is better off for their presence, it would obviously be quite impossible now to organize any effective sentiment against their further coming.

An argument, therefore, against all these projects to restrict immigration, is the fact that the evils threatened from the coming of any particular race may not prove so serious as is at first supposed. If the French Canadians turn out so much better than was anticipated, it may be that we shall not suffer so much harm as some people have feared from the invasion of some other nationality. But a still more serious obstacle to any rigorous law restricting immigration is the politician's fear of offending some "element" among the voters. It may be true, as the Bangor *News* says, that the French Canadian is "not a politician or an office-seeker," but there is not a politician or office-seeker in all New England who would say anything to offend "the French-Canadian vote." And there is a "vote" in this country now of almost every race on the globe—except "the heathen Chinee."

WOOL AND WOOLLENS.

THE *American Wool and Cotton Reporter* considers it pretty certain that the wool and woollens tariff will be overhauled by the present House of Representatives, because "it is difficult for a party to restrain itself from acting according to its controlling principles." The prospect being what it is, and the avowed intention of the Democratic party being to put wool on the free list anyhow, the *Reporter* discusses the question of the compensating duties on woollens. The duties on woollens are made up of two parts: first, ad-valorem duties for protection to the manufacturers; second, specific (or pound) duties to compensate the manufacturer for the duties on wool. For example, paragraph 397 of the McKinley Act provides that on women's and children's woollen cloaks or other outside garments the duty per pound shall be four and one-half times the duty imposed on a pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 60 per cent. ad valorem. The duty on a pound of unwashed wool of the first class is 11 cents, and the theory is that it takes four-and-a-half pounds of such wool to make one pound of cloth. Consequently, the rate of duty on the goods mentioned is 49½ cents per pound and 60 per cent. ad valorem. The rate before McKinley gave it a lift was 45 cents per pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem. If wool were put on the free list and only the compensating duties repealed, the rate on women's and children's cloaks would be just 60 per cent., which appears to be sufficiently oppressive.

It seems probable that the only controversy in the Democratic ranks when Mr. Springer introduces his free-wool bill will be over these compensating duties. It becomes important, therefore, to know what the manufacturers said would be sufficient protection for them at the time when the high-tariff policy on wool and woollens was adopted. The tariff of 1867, relating to wool and woollens exclusively, was prepared by a joint committee of the National Association of Wool-Manufacturers and of the National Wool-Growers' Association. Their resolutions are embraced in the report of Stephen Colwell, a member of the United States Revenue Commission, published in the Commission's general report for 1865-66 (page 340). The second resolution is as follows:

"(2.) All manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool or worsted shall be subjected to a duty which shall be equal to 25 per cent. net; that is to say, 25 per cent. after reimbursing the amount paid on account of duties on wool, dyestuffs, and other imported materials used in such manufactures, and also the amount paid for the internal-revenue tax imposed on manufactures and upon the supplies and materials used therefor."

This report was signed by the chiefs of the woollen-manufacturing industry of that day, viz.: E. B. Bigelow, T. S. Foxton, Edw. Harris, J. Wiley Edmands, S. W. Cattell, H. Kingsbury, and Theodore Pomeroy. It was signed also by John L. Hayes as Secretary of the Joint Committee. Twenty-five per cent. was all that they wanted over and above the compensating duties, notwithstanding which self-denial a generous Congress voted that it should be 35 per cent. The Tariff Commission of 1883 took their stand on 35 per cent. over and above the compensating duties, and quoted with approval a speech of Gen. Garfield showing how fair that arrangement was. Again did a liberal-minded Congress go beyond any demands that the manufacturers had presented publicly. The protection over and above compensation was raised in many cases to 40 and even 50 per cent., and McKinley gave it another hitch of about 10 per cent.

Now the *Wool and Cotton Reporter* lets a cat out of the bag by saying that the pound duties are protective to the manufacturer, and the ones which can least be spared by him. "The compensating duties," it says, "are not generally regarded as protective—they are designed and intended to equalize and offset the duties upon the raw wool; yet, in point of fact, the greater strength of the protective policy, so far as pertains to the woollen schedule, lies in these duties, and were it not for the pound duty there would be far greater disturbance in the goods market, coming from importations of low-grade goods. Those woollen manufacturers who place stress upon the ad-valorem duties upon goods are not wholly ingenuous. The main reliance is upon the weight duty." We do not pretend to be skilled in this matter, but we have long suspected that the compensating duties were a good deal more than compensatory—that, for example, four and a half pounds of unwashed wool were not required

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to make one pound of the kind of cloth that enters into women's cloaks. If there has been some cheating here in the framing of the tariff, we can understand why the proposition to repeal the so-called compensating duties on woollens is so little liked by the manufacturers. It would probably repeal something which was not compensatory, but clear gain. The *Wool and Cotton Reporter* embraces the occasion to give the Wool-Manufacturers' Association a little lecture on their share in the McKinley legislation. It considers the doubt and uncertainty which hangs over the industry very harmful, and says:

"For this the framers of the McKinley Bill have themselves to blame, since it was possible for them to have so used their great opportunity of a friendly majority in both houses of Congress in 1890 as to have framed a bill which, while sufficiently protective, would have been approved by the average common sense of the American people, and would have been enough of a finality to relieve the woollen industry from the evils of tariff agitation for a decade. Indeed, if the McKinley Bill had never been passed, it is not at all certain that the lower house of Congress would now be Democratic. The woollen industry is unfortunate in serving as the vehicle in which both political parties are disposed to give their tariff policy a constant airing."

THE NEW YORK CONTESTED ELECTION CASES.

THE Republicans have lost control of the State Senate, and have thereby given the Democrats complete control of the Legislature, by their own folly. If they had not persisted in running Mr. Sherwood as their candidate for the Senate in the Twenty-seventh District, after they had been made aware of his ineligibility, they would not be in a minority in the Senate to-day. Then, too, if the Republican County Clerk in the Twenty-fifth District had exercised proper care in his work of distributing ballots, there would have been no question as to the election of a Republican Senator in that district. The decisions of the Court of Appeals on these two cases are of themselves sufficient to take the control of the Senate from the Republicans, and we are unable to see how the Republicans could have anticipated any other conclusion.

These two decisions are upon questions of great interest as regards the interpretation of our election laws. Mr. Sherwood was at the time of his election a Park Commissioner of Hornellsville. The Constitution declares that "no person shall be eligible to the Legislature who, at the time of his election, is, or within 100 days previous thereto has been, a member of Congress, a civil or military officer under the United States, or an officer under any city government." The Court of Appeals decides that Mr. Sherwood was not eligible, that he violated the Constitution in seeking the votes of electors, that electors violated it in voting for him, and that, as a matter of constitutional law, any certificate which a canvassing board might issue to him would be an absolute nullity, since the "only use he could make of it would be to violate the Constitution, and do wrong by intrusion to an office which he has no right for one moment to hold." Finally, the Court says:

"Sherwood and his competitor may both present their cases to the Senate without either of them having a certificate of election, and that body will have jurisdiction to determine all the questions of fact and law involved in the matter. If it shall agree with this court that the relator was ineligible, and also find that his competitor was not elected, the result will be that a new election will have to be ordered in that district; and the electors there can then choose a person qualified to hold the office, and then they can be properly represented in the Senate. It is far better that they should be called upon to vote again than that the Constitution should be violated."

The decision in the case of the erroneously distributed ballots in the Twenty-fifth District is equally clear and important. Ballots officially marked and signed by the County Clerk for the First District in one town were distributed and voted in the Second District, and those for the First and Second Districts in another town were transposed and thus used in the election. The question before the court was whether or not this irregular use invalidated the votes cast with such ballots. The law plainly requires that the designation or number of the election-district endorsement shall be precisely the same; and in all cases that designation or number shall be that of the polling-place or election district where the vote is offered, and no other. The Court holds that the ballots in question "were cast in utter disregard of this important provision of the statute," that "the endorsement upon them differed from the regular endorsement on all the other ballots used or voted at the same polling-place; and, as they were used or voted by but one of the parties that had made nominations, or, in other words, in behalf of but one candidate or set of candidates, the voters who used them necessarily disclosed to such bystanders as could or desired to observe, the candidates voted for." This the Court declares to be a violation of the secrecy of the ballot. Upon the question as to whether ballots thus cast shall be counted, the Court cites the provision of the law which says that "no ballot that has not the printed official endorsement shall be counted," and decides:

"We are unable to construe this language when applied to the facts of this case in any other way than as the clear and positive mandate of the Legislature to the canvassers to reject and treat as void all ballots found in the box, prepared for and bearing the designation and number of another and a different polling-place or election district than the one where the ballot was cast. The Legislature has forbidden the elector to cast such a ballot. It has prohibited the inspectors from placing it in the box, and the canvassers from counting it. But it is said this result will disfranchise the electors who cast these ballots in good faith, believing that they were the proper official ballots. The answer is, that when an elector attempts to express his will at an election by the use through either design or accident of ballots which the law declares shall not be counted, the courts have no power to help him."

In view of these decisions, which strike us as eminently sound both in law and in common sense, we do not see how the State Canvassers could pursue any other course in these cases than they did in their subsequent meeting. They declared Sherwood not elected, and referred the question of whether his opponent was elected or not to the Senate for decision, and issued a certificate of election to the Democratic contestant in the Twenty-fifth District by rejecting the transposed ballots cast for his opponent. The effect of both decisions, and of the Canvassing Board's action in accordance therewith, will be to make nominating conventions and county clerks more careful hereafter to keep within the letter of the law. The Republicans of this State, especially in reference to their conduct in the Senate, have got into the habit of looking upon themselves as rather above the law—that is, regarding the law as something to be twisted and tortured this way and that to suit their convenience. They have received a lesson now which they will not soon forget.

We wish that we could commend the action of the Canvassing Board in the case of the Fifteenth Senatorial District as unreservedly as in the other cases. This is the district in which Mr. Deane, the Republican candidate, died soon after the election. There has never been any doubt that he was legally elected. The County Canvassers refused to count a certain number of votes which had been cast for him because the Inspectors of Election had written his name incorrectly on the blanks containing their returns. There was no question about the correctness of the ballots. The clerk refused to sign the canvassers' certificate for the Democratic candidate, and a mandamus was issued ordering the canvassers to send the returns back to the inspectors for correction. In the meantime the certificate, unsigned by the clerk, got to Albany and to the State Canvassing Board. The Court afterwards ordered a certificate, based on the corrected returns, to be issued to Mr. Deane. No sooner was this certificate issued than the Democrats, under the guidance of Gov. Hill, began to resort to all possible methods to prevent its reaching Albany. It was mandamused and countermandamused repeatedly, got to Albany once by mail, and was taken from the hands of the postal messenger before it could reach the Canvassing Board.

The only questions before the Court of Appeals were as to the validity of the first certificate, which had not been signed by the clerk, and the right of the lower court to issue an order to the State Canvassers not to canvass an illegal return. The substance of the Court's decision was the following:

"Upon these facts, standing uncontradicted, we think the court below, in its proper branch, would have the power to command the State Canvassers to canvass without regard to such a return. As it contained the result of an illegal and erroneous canvass by the Board of Canvassers in excess of its jurisdiction, and which thereby would alter the result of an election, the court should not permit it to be canvassed. As to the allegations of the manner of the making of the return by the County Board, the State Board could not itself inquire into them. If another return should be sent to the Board, properly authenticated and containing the re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sult of the legal action of the Board of County Canvassers, the State Board could canvass it."

When the Board met last week, the illegal return was presented, but the corrected return was not produced, though it was known to have been sent in accordance with the Court's orders, and was believed to be in Albany. The Secretary of State, Mr. Rice, who was acting as Chairman, declined to make any reply whatever when he was asked if he had received it, and the Board issued a certificate to the Democratic contestant upon the basis of the only county return that was visibly before it. This was a purely partisan proceeding, and one of which the Canvassing Board ought to be ashamed. The fair course would have been to declare that there was no candidate elected from the district, and thus make necessary a new election.

On general principles, the result is a cause for congratulation. The Democrats are entitled to the control of the Legislature, and they would have secured it by a large majority if the election had been held under a fair apportionment. They will now authorize a redistricting of the State, and will possibly see the wisdom of making it as fair as possible. In the meantime, they will be entirely responsible for the administration of the State Government, and that will be a gain over the former condition of things. No one who remembers the partisan manner in which the Republican majority in the Senate has used its power to prevent the Governor from exercising his constitutional power of appointment, will regard the loss of the Senate to that party as in any sense a public calamity.

BURLESQUE IN THEOLOGY.

A LITTLE pamphlet or tract has just been published in this city, and is said to be circulating in large numbers, entitled 'The New Theology in the Nursery.' No name either of author or of publisher appears upon it, yet it is carefully printed, is ornamented with an ancient cut which looks as if it might have come out of the stores of the Tract Society of fifty years ago, and is evidently intended for wide distribution and reading. It is an attempt to make the views of Prof. Briggs and his sympathizers ridiculous by putting them, or a burlesque of them, into the mouth of a mother instructing her child.

We subjoin a fair specimen of the talk that goes on between "Mrs. Martineau Kuenen" and her precocious son "Johnny":

"Tell me, Johnny, what is it which teaches us how to be saved, and about Heaven and God?"

"The Bible."

"Yes; but there is something else."

"I don't know of anything else."

"There is the Church, you know; and the Reason."

"Do you mean the Presbyterian Church, mamma?"

"Well, not exactly. You see, the Presbyterian Church sometimes disapproves of my good friend Professor Barkis."

"But suppose you can't find God in the Bible or in the Church, then what do you do?"

"I am glad you have asked that question, my child. You can find God through the Reason, and become a representative Christian."

"What is the Reason, mamma?"

"Oh, I don't know exactly. It embraces the Metaphysical Categories."

. . . . . .

"I thought you said just now that the Bible was infallible."

"Only as a rule of faith and practice. It is not infallible when it contains fibs" (laughing to herself).

We have consistently refrained from taking sides in the theological debate raging about Prof. Briggs as a centre, and we do not now mean to consider directly the value of this latest argument of his opponents. It is said to meet with high favor among them, and to be thought by them a very convincing presentation of their case against him. We know nothing about that, and have no wish to examine their argument on its merits—conceding that it has any. But upon the method they have followed—a method most surprising, considering the persons and cause employing and endorsing it—it is entirely proper for us to comment.

The first thing to be remarked is, that this resort to burlesque in theological argument is had by those who have uniformly condemned it in others. Indeed, one of the most serious causes of offence which they found in Prof. Briggs's famous Inaugural Address was its unseemly levity in a certain part. He affirmed that the Bible was no better than a mass-book to stop a bullet, and not half as good as holy water for putting out a fire. Hands of holy horror rose on all sides at that deliverance, but one pair of them at least has now dropped, to lay hold of a pen and write in a vein beside which the most flippant saying of Prof. Briggs's becomes reverence itself. In fact, the whole tone of this pamphlet reminds us strikingly of some of Col. Ingersoll's parodies of the Westminster Confession. Those not very witty or delicate effusions have won for their author the reputation of a blasphemer among those very persons who now applaud a production conceived in precisely the same spirit.

They seem unaware that it is an edged tool they are grasping. If it is a question of reducing to the absurd, the undiluted Westminster is much more open to it than the views attacked in this pamphlet. The "Metaphysical Categories" and "Christian Consciousness" and "Institutional Christianity" are not very easy themes to crack jokes upon. The more racy language of the Catechism, in what it has to say about such subjects as "reprobation" and "elect infants" and the damnation of all the heathen, is far more capable of being burlesqued, and, especially when put into the mouth of a mother talking with her child, made to appear monstrous. The wit in that case might appear more ghastly, but it would certainly seem less labored than it does in 'The New Theology in the Nursery.' If the latter's method is to be accepted as a proper one in theological discussion, then there is no longer any reason to object to Carlyle's audacious characterization of the Westminster divines, or Heine's most crackling epigram against theology, or Burns's "Holy Willie's Prayer."

Leaving this question of consistency with those whom it concerns, we should say, for our own part, that a real sense of humor is one of the greatest needs of theologians. Luther's shaking sides and hearty laugh give his personality and words a warmth and carrying-power which one does not find in his severe contemporary of Geneva. Nor can there be any doubt that his type of character is steadily gaining the upper hand in the modern ministry. Some of the stiffest Calvinists the world has ever known have, of course, been fellows of infinite jest in private life. But nowadays Calvinists more and more venture on a smile in the pulpit itself. Whatever may be said about that and its propriety, we think that the growing tendency to light up the professionally solemn debates of theologians on their technical subjects by the introduction of a laugh is by no means a bad thing. Nothing else so quickly exposes absurdity or pretence, and often the real *dicere verum*, even in theology, has come from one *quamquam ridentem*.

THE POPE AND THE POOR.

THE Pope issued the Encyclical known as *Rerum Novarum* some months ago, taking up the cause of Labor, urging employers to be more benevolent, and workingmen to be more faithful and to respect property as of divine institution, and directing the Catholic clergy to occupy themselves more than heretofore with economical and social questions. It attracted very little attention either from Labor or from the clergy. It was read in all the Catholic churches, but we believe no attempt to act on it or under it has yet been made by priests or bishops in any Catholic country. There were two reasons for this. One was that it promulgated nothing new either in religion or in political economy. The morality of it was the old morality which has been preached, and to a greater or less extent practised, in all Christian countries ever since the emancipation of labor and the substitution of wages for stripes. Nobody who goes to church, or looks up to the Pope as the supreme Doctor on earth, found in it any new light on any of the troublesome social questions of the day.

The second reason was, that the clergy were unable to see how the study of political and social economy was to profit them in the discharge of their functions as Christian ministers. The duties of a Catholic priest are to teach religion and morality either from the pulpit or in the confessional, and to administer the sacraments. How is he to attack the labor question through either of these instrumentalities? He has nothing new to say about the relation of employer and employed. He cannot, without a complete

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge of the facts and of the business, declare which side is right in any particular labor dispute. Much less can he inflict ecclesiastical punishment on an employer for not paying more wages, or on a laborer for not laying more bricks or heaving more coal. Moreover, the labor question as a source of social disturbance may be said to exist only in cities, and, as a rule, the laborers who raise it there pay no attention to the authority of the Church, and the employers resent bitterly clerical interference. In the rural districts, in which the clergy are, in some countries, still powerful, there is no labor question. England may at first sight seem to be an exception, because there is there considerable discontent among the agricultural laborers, but it is not showing itself in quarrels with employers. It is showing itself in the quiet desertion of the country for the city by the able-bodied men; and the clergyman of the parish, as the representative of the old authoritative régime, is the person of all to whose advice the departing laborers pay least attention. Great discredit, too, has been brought on the clergy as social economists by the interference of a number of them, headed by Cardinal Manning, on behalf of the strikers at the London docks. It produced confusion worse confounded. The "reconciliation" it brought about lasted a month and made business impossible. The dock companies had to do at last what they ought to have done at first—settle their business in their own way, on principles of human nature.

Curiously enough, however, one of the hardest-headed economists in Europe, one of the least sentimental, M. Leroy-Beaulieu, the editor of the *Économiste Français*, considers the Encyclical a most important document, and devotes a long article in the last *Revue des Deux Mondes* to the discussion of it as the sign of a new era. What magnifies it in his eyes is, that it is an announcement on the part of the Pope that the Church has definitively broken with the Princes and Potentates with whom it has associated and acted for 1,200 years, and has recognized Democracy as the new power which is hereafter to govern the world, and with which, and not with thrones and dynasties, the Papacy must hereafter make concordats and treaties. This alliance fully effected, he thinks the Pope likely to a considerable extent to resume his old place as the teacher and arbitrator and Custos Morum of the Western world. It has been brought about mainly or in part by the way in which he has been treated in the matter of the temporal power by his brother rulers. The day the Italian troops were allowed to enter Rome through the Porta Pia, the Papacy dissolved its old alliance with the kings of the West and fell back on the poor laity, whose champion and protector and guide it is now to be.

M. Leroy-Beaulieu is very likely right in saying that the Papacy has adopted a new policy and is making terms with the Democracy, and that the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* is a virtual repudiation of the Syllabus of Pius IX.; but how a man who looks at modern society as coolly as our Frenchman does, can believe that the Papacy can win back its old prestige by adopting the new Socialistic gospel as part and parcel of the old Christian Gospel, it is hard to see. What sustained the Papacy in the Middle Ages, and gave importance to the Pope's utterances, was the popular belief—not that of Kings and nobles only—that the history of the Papacy, as told by the Popes, was strictly and literally true; that the Pope, in short, owed his moral authority to the occurrence of certain undoubted events, part in Judea and part in Rome, in the first 500 years of the Christian era. Without this faith there never could have been any Pope at all. Without it the Pope cannot now last as an authority on any subject more than any other Christian minister.

Does modern Democracy hold this faith? Every one knows it does not. To the mass of the working classes in the great towns of Europe and America, the Pope's account of himself is, we venture to assert, looked on as either an amiable delusion or an absurd fable. The beliefs which built up the Papacy are, in fact, to-day almost as shadowy as the beliefs which built up the Roman Empire. The Pope is still surrounded with the respect due to a blameless life and a great tradition, but the willingness to take him as a guide in the transaction of mundane affairs is very like the loyalty which surrounds the Queen of England. It finds expression in the ceremonies, speeches, articles, poetry, and painting, of those who cultivate the sentimental side of life as a protest against the materialism of the age; but a serious proposal that the Pope should be allowed to settle the manner in which the products of labor and capital should be divided, would probably be received with laughter in every Trades Union in the world. And this is "the labor problem." There is and can be no other. The earth produces under human industry a certain amount of good things every year. The man who makes a rule of distribution which everybody concerned will accept and work under cheerfully, will have solved this problem. But who is this man? By what sign shall we know him? It is easy enough to bestow the blessing of the Church on Henry George and Karl Marx and Terence V. Powderly, but the acceptable rule of distribution is still wanting.

THOMAS PAINE AND MADAME BONNEVILLE.

New York, January 1, 1892.

In June, 1791, Thomas Paine founded the first Republican Society in Europe, and wrote its manifesto, which, on July 1, placarded Paris, being even nailed on the door of the National Assembly. Royalist rage swelled the Society to vast dimensions, and it was only some years later that Paine made known the fact that this formidable Club had consisted of five members. He did not mention their names, but two certainly were Condorcet and Achille Duchâtelet. There is reason to believe that the others were Brissot and Nicolas Bonneville. Bonneville, then in his thirty-first year, had written some striking poems, and translated into French parts of Shakspeare and several German stories. He may have translated into French Paine's republican appeal to France. He edited *La Bouche de Fer*, a journal which did much to defeat the scheme for making Marat dictator after the King's flight.

When the Reign of Terror was past, and Paine emerged from his long imprisonment, he and Bonneville were almost the only republicans of the "philosophical" school whom the guillotine had left. Bonneville was now editing the *Bien Informé*, and kept a sort of bookstore for progressive publications at his residence, 4 Rue du Théâtre-Français. Paine, though ill and feeble, occasionally wrote for Bonneville's journal, and when Monroe, at whose house he was nursed back into life, was recalled, the Bonnevilles invited him to take up his abode in their home. There he remained from 1797 to his return to America in 1802. It was not without remuneration, as Rickman, friend of all the parties, attests. The Bonnevilles had been married about three years, and their second child was named after Paine, his godfather. There was not much money among them, but they were attached to each other, and held the same political views. No doubt Bonneville was a member of the Society of Theophilanthropists which Paine founded in Paris. While Paine was here, Bonaparte, as yet professing republicanism, consulted him on a proposal for liberating the English and Irish people by a descent on England. Bonaparte told Paine that he slept with the 'Rights of Man' under his pillow, and that he (Paine) ought to have a statue of gold in every city; but he presently suppressed Bonneville's paper, that *littérateur* being thus reduced to utter poverty.

Nevertheless, these old comrades through the Reign of Terror clung together. The chief room in the humble house was given up to Paine, who in it wrote pamphlets and carried on his inventions. He had daily visitors, and means had to be adopted for defending him against the merely curious. But there were visitors worth seeing, among them Fulton, Walter Savage Landor, and Henry Redhead Yorke, of whom the latter two have left records of Paine's conversation. "A jolly-looking woman," in whom we recognize Mme. Bonneville, opened the door for Yorke, and "believed Mr. Paine was not at home," until she learned that the visitor was an old friend from England. Then she was all smiles. Paine's room, orderly for himself, was wild disorder to Yorke:

> "Three shelves were filled with pasteboard boxes, each labelled after the manner of a Minister of Foreign Affairs, *Correspondance Américaine, Britannique, Française; Notices politiques; Le Citoyen Français, etc.* In one corner of the room stood several huge bars of iron and two large trunks; opposite the fireplace a board covered with pamphlets and journals, having more the appearance of a dresser in a scullery than a sideboard. Such was the wretched habitation of Thomas Paine, one of the founders of American Independence."

When Paine was about to return to America, he urged the Bonnevilles to go with him and take up their abode in this country. About a year after Paine's arrival here, Madame Bonneville did come with her three children (sons), her husband remaining in Paris. Paine supported them all and sent the boys to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good schools. At his death Margaret Brazier Bonneville was his chief legatee and an executor, her husband and children also receiving bequests.

Here were all the materials for scandal, and Paine's religious opponents could not be expected to forego such an exemplification of the practical tendencies of 'The Age of Reason.' The Federalists, just then collecting certificates of Jefferson's alleged laxities, were holding up "the two Toms" as illustrations of the French morals to be introduced in America. Paine wrote in the *American Citizen* a defence of Jefferson against such charges, little knowing that in the year of his death the editor of that paper, James Cheetham, would brand him in the same way. "Paine," wrote Cheetham, "brought with him from Paris, and from her husband in whose house he had lived, Margaret Brazier Bonneville and her three sons. *Thomas* has the features, countenance, and temper of Paine." Madame successfully sued Cheetham for slander. The trial was argued on June 19, 1810, and I am indebted to our industrious collector of *causes célèbres*, Mr. Edmund B. Wynn of Watertown, N. Y., for a perusal of Counsellor Sampson's tremendous invective, which caused Cheetham to claim protection of the Court and hint at a duel. The Recorder (Hoffman), a bitter foe of "the two Toms," summed up in Cheetham's favor, and when he was brought up for sentence highly commended his 'Life of Paine,' declaring that "it tended to serve the cause of religion." He imposed a fine of only $150, from which the costs were to be deducted.

Mme. Bonneville had eminent friends in court to testify to her character—Thomas Addis Emmett, Fulton, and ladies whose children she had taught French. The only important witness against her, William Carver, confessed that he used to take his wife to call on the plaintiff. It appeared that Carver, an Englishman in whose house Paine boarded for some months and was maltreated, had been taken out of Paine's will, which enraged him against the legatee. Probably when Cheetham saw the plaintiff, whose youthful appearance and refined manners are still remembered, he saw with the jury that any illicit relation between her and the prematurely aged invalid was preposterous. But his slander seems immortal, having found its way into important encyclopædias. That of McClintock and Strong, for instance, says: "One of the women he supported [in France] followed him to this country." Nay, long years after his mother's vindication, rumors followed the late Gen. Bonneville, and whispered that he was the illegitimate son of Thomas Paine.

The sentence of Cheetham had not explained why Nicolas Bonneville did not join his family in this country. On this point Paine's friendly biographers have been silent. He did come after Paine's death, and Washington Irving, in his account of Gen. Bonneville, has left us a picturesque description of the venerable Nicolas seated beneath the trees at the Battery, absorbed in his book. I have hitherto been of the opinion that Nicolas, after hearing from his wife that Paine had less means than they supposed, and having no hope of being able to support himself in America, concluded not to add himself to Paine's burdens, though he believed his pauperized family had claims on the man they had so long sheltered and nursed in Paris. But I have just come into possession of an unpublished letter written by Paine to Bonneville, which casts a ray of light on the subject. It is not dated, but the personal allusions make out the year to be 1807. The italics are in the original:

"My Dear Bonneville: I received your letter by Mr. Champlin, and also the letter for Mrs. Bonneville, and one from her sister. I have written to the American Minister in Paris, Mr. Armstrong, desiring him to interest himself to have your *surveillance* taken off *on condition of your coming to join your family in the United States.*

"This letter, with Mrs. Bonneville's, come together under cover to the American Minister from Mr. Madison, Secretary of State. As soon as you receive it I advise you to call on General Armstrong and inform him of the proper method to have your surveillance taken off. Mr. Champagny, who succeeds Talleyrand, is, I suppose, the same who was Minister of the Interior, from whom I received a handsome friendly letter respecting the Iron Bridge. I think you once went with me to see him.

"Call on Mr. Skipwith with my compliments. He will inform you what vessels sail for New York and where from. Bordeaux will be the best place to sail from. I believe Mr. Lee is American Consul at Bordeaux. When you arrive there, call on him with my compliments. You may contrive to arrive at New York in April or May. The passages in the spring are generally short—seldom more than five weeks, and often less.

"Present my respects to Mercier, Bernardin St. Pierre, Dupuis, Grégoire. When you come I intend publishing all my works, and those I have in manuscript, by subscription. They will make four or five volumes 4to, or five vols. 8vo, about 400 pages each.

"Yours in friendship,
"T. P."

Thus not only had Napoleon suppressed Bonneville's publications, but placed him under surveillance. This was not, indeed, the reason for his not sailing to America with his wife in 1803. A note of Madame Bonneville says he was then detained by "some affairs of great consequence; but foreseeing a new revolution, that would strike, even personally, many of the Republicans, it was resolved, soon after the departure of Mr. Paine for America, that I should go thither with my children, relying fully on the good faith of Mr. Paine, whose conduct in America justified that reliance." In those years radicals lived as they could. The wild political and social tempests of ten years had thrown thousands of families into such complications, and so familiarized revolutionists with situations and relations that would be misunderstood in peaceful communities, that it evidently did not occur to any of these parties that Madame's coming hither and her support by Paine might be a subject of gossip. She was at this time thirty-five and Paine sixty-six years of age. She sailed for America in the autumn of 1803, which was the time of the secret attempt by French Royalists in England to form an alliance with the Republican revolutionists in France against Bonaparte. This, perhaps, was the "revolution" foreseen by Bonneville, which made him anxious to get his family out of France. In the spring of 1804 hostilities became active between France and England. All Englishmen in France between eighteen and sixty years of age were arrested. Bonneville, being a fluent speaker of English and German, and always much sought by foreigners, was also an old friend of Gen. Moreau, afterwards tried for participation in the conspiracy against Bonaparte, and banished to America. It may have been then that Bonneville came under surveillance, and it would surely have continued through 1806, when Bonaparte was imperializing literature and religion. The above letter to Bonneville shows his circle, in which we find the learned free-thinker Dupuis and the indomitable Abbé Grégoire, a man whom Bonaparte especially feared. It was Grégoire who introduced Paine into the French Convention (September, 1792); he sympathized with Paine's plea for the life of Louis XVI., and remained his friend through life.

Of the three sons of Nicolas and Madame Bonneville, Louis seems to have returned to his father in France. Thomas entered the United States Navy in boyhood, and, it is said, was slain in the last war with England, after winning distinction by some exploit associated with a sword preserved by his elder brother, Gen. Benjamin Bonneville. Madame Bonneville finally left France in 1830, and passed the rest of her days near her remaining son, in St. Louis. Her tomb is there, in Bellefontaine Cemetery: "To my Mother, Margaret B., relict of Nicholas de Bonneville, Député de 1789, France. She departed this life October 30, 1846. Aged 79 years." Beside her tomb are those of Gen. Bonneville and his family. The General's epitaph is: "In Memory of Gen. B. L. E. Bonneville, U. S. A. Born April 14, 1796; died June 12, 1878, at Fort Smith, Ark."

"Here lies one whose noble deeds
Have not escaped the page of fame,
The generations yet unborn
Shall know the Records of his honored name."
"May he rest in Peace."

Although by some vexation caused the General about his mother's burial, as I am told, these graves are not in the Catholic cemetery, Mme. Bonneville, in her later years, became a devout Catholic, as was her son the General. It may have been due to that fact, and in part to fear of reviving a miserable scandal, that their lips were always sealed concerning Thomas Paine, to whom, however, the Bonnevilles owed their rescue from poverty and the early education of their children.

Moncure D. Conway.

Correspondence.

CUTTING BOTH WAYS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: A notable illustration of the way in which forms come to substitute themselves for things is found in our modes of separation of Executive and Legislature. Instead of that which alone has any real significance, a just balance of executive and legislative *powers*, the separation has come to mean shutting up those who represent the Executive in one building or set of buildings, and those who represent the Legislature in another, with every precaution being taken against any public communication between them. The evil of this is apparent in two directions. In the first place, it turns the Legislature into a mob, by depriving it of that official guidance which is just as much Executive work as the administration of the Post-office and the Mint. Of this the examples are of daily occurrence. But, on the other hand, it shields the Executive from that public and enforced responsibility which is the only real safeguard against abuse. A perfect example of this is found in our relations with Chili.

Could there be anything in the world more monstrous or more disgraceful than that we should make war upon that unhappy country? After a long period of constitutional government which placed it at the head of South American republics, it has just been through a revolution, brought on by an unscrupulous adventurer seeking to establish despotism, which has shaken it to its foundations. It may suit a Napoleon or a Bismarck to take advantage of such a state of things to plunder his neighbors, but there is no evidence to show that the people

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the United States desire either glory or plunder to be had from crushing a weaker sister. Yet, because a so-called Minister and a naval captain choose to take fire at a supposed insult, which it is at least doubtful if they were not themselves instrumental in bringing about, and because there is a man at the head of the State Department whose whole connection with foreign affairs has been to "meddle and muddle," therefore we may at any moment, while neither Congress nor the country has any information as to the facts, be thrust into a situation from which, according to army and navy ideas of honor, there will be no issue short of war.

If the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Navy had to stand up daily in Congress and encounter cross-examination from individual members, the country might learn something of the real proceedings of Minister Egan and Captain Schley, and so have a wider chance of escaping from this miserable pitfall.

G. B.

Boston, January 2, 1892.

THE HISTORICAL STUDY OF RELIGIONS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: There is perhaps no field of work which has yielded such fruitful results as has the new science of the historical study of religions. It is still in its infancy, for in its early growth it has had to fight its way against heavier odds than ever beset a young science. It has had to combat the prejudice of those who wrongly thought that it bore agnosticism and atheism in its train, and its own votaries too often impaired its scientific character by wild deductions and unfounded generalizations. In spite of all this, it has asserted itself. It has shown what an all-important factor it is in the study of anthropology and history. Its aim is simply an historical and thoroughly unprejudiced study of the forms of belief and of practice as shown in all the religious systems of the world; not only of the savage and half-civilized races, but also of those nations whose religious beliefs have been dominant factors in forming the civilization of our day. In France this new science has called forth a special organ, the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, edited by the talented Jean Réville. In Holland and Belgium the Universities have separate chairs for its study. In England the Hibbert and Gifford lectureships have brought the subject prominently before the English-speaking world. Our museums are beginning to pay special attention to this work: the Musée Guimet in Paris—established in 1885 by the munificence of M. Émile Guimet, a Lyons manufacturer—is given up exclusively to an historical representation of religious ceremonials and ideas.

It is a matter for congratulation that here in America attention has also been directed to this study. In Boston and Cambridge a circle has been formed, under the direction of Prof. Toy, for the study of religions. In the University of Pennsylvania, a part of the lectures delivered under the auspices of the University Lecture Association are devoted to this subject. The University of the City of New York has a lectureship in comparative religions, and it is purposed by the Oriental section of the Brooklyn Institute to have a course of lectures this winter on the temples and forms of worship in the East. At the Plymouth School of Ethics last summer, representatives of different faiths were invited to present their systems before the school.

It has occurred to many who are interested in the work, that if a series of lectures—at once scientific and popular in form—were established here in America to present to the public the results of the scientific study of religions, it would go far towards interesting a large number of people in the subject. For this purpose a meeting was held here in the rooms of the Historical Society, pursuant to a call signed by Dr. Edward Bartlett, Dr. George Dana Boardman, Dr. Daniel G. Brinton, Prof. Morris Jastrow, Dr. William Pepper, Mrs. Sara Yorke Stevenson of Philadelphia, Prof. Paul Haupt of Baltimore, Prof. D. G. Lyon and Prof. C. H. Toy of Boston, Prof. Frederick W. Hooper of Brooklyn, Prof. W. R. Harper and Dr. Emil G. Hirsch of Chicago, Prof. C. F. Briggs, Dr. W. Hayes Ward, and Prof. John P. Peters of New York.

The general plan, as given to a special committee for a detailed report, contemplated a series of six lectures each year, to be delivered by the most eminent specialists in the different subjects—both American and European. In order to give these lectures as wide a prominence as possible, it is intended that they shall be delivered in Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Chicago. In these different cities special committees or existing lecture associations are to be in charge. It is hoped that in Boston the Lowell Institute, in Brooklyn the Brooklyn Institute, in Philadelphia the Lecture Association of the University of Pennsylvania, in Baltimore the Peabody Institute, and in Chicago the new University will make all necessary arrangements. Some of the most eminent specialists have been corresponded with, and have shown great willingness to meet the wishes of the Committee. It is also intended to publish the lectures in book form; and, in time, perhaps we may have an American Series of Hibbert Lectures which shall be worthy of standing on the same shelf as those which bear the names of Thiele, Kuenen, Pfleiderer, Hatch, Sayce, and Max Müller.

R. G.

Philadelphia, December 30, 1891.

"ADVOCATE," THE VERBS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Having chanced on a parcel of notes, long ago mislaid, I find that, taken with some recent memorandums, they enable me to supplement, on several points, and those not unimportant, the details given, under these words, in the *New English Dictionary*.

Advocate, as derived from the Latin participial stem *advocat-*, is there assigned two senses.

By possibility, however, it has been tentatively saddled with a third sense. This appears from the subjoined quotation, of the year 1592, occurring in Bp. Andrewes's *Sermons*, vol. v., p. 533 (ed. 1843), but, at least in its wording, of uncertain authorship:

"We are to think upon the name of God as of a heavy and weighty thing, that is not upon small occasion to be taken up and removed. We are not to account it as a feather that we may lightly toss up and down at our pleasure: and even so are we to esteem of the mercy of God. It is not to be *advocated* [signifying, if not misreported for, *invocated*, 'invoked'] upon every vain trifle. For that were to use God as we are wont to use our jugglers. 'Come on; let us see what you can do; shew us a miracle,' say they [? we]."

In the next place, as denoting 'call to a higher tribunal,' it does not exclusively belong to the phraseology of Scotch Law; and it was established considerably before 1629. Here are the proofs:

"For, in case the Pope, as God forbydde, shulde *advocate* the said cause," etc. Steven Gardyner (?1529), in Sir Henry Ellis's *Original Letters*, Third Series, vol. ii., p. 157 (ed. 1846).

"The Queen made her protestation, . . . alleging the cause to be *advocated* by the Pope's holiness." Dr. Nicholas Harpsfield, *Treatise on the Pretended Divorce of Henry VIII.* (c. 1555), p. 181 (Camden Society, 1878).

"Afterward, we having intelligence that the Vice-chancellor proceeded not to the execution of our said commission, we revoked the same, and *advocated* the said cause to our own examination." Abp. Parker and others (1569), in Abp. Parker's *Correspondence* (1853), p. 344.

I now pass to the verb *advocate* which was suggested by the substantive *advocate*.

That Milton, as adduced by Dr. Murray, used it intransitively in 1641 is questionable. But the Rev. Peter Heylyn certainly so used it in 1637:

"The Minister *advocates for* the Arians, and will not have them be the Authors of sitting at the holy Sacrament." *Antidotum Lincolniense*, Part iii., p. 34.

Also, in the last century, it was so used by De Foe:

"But, when I have thus far *advocated for* the enemies, I must be very free to state the crimes of this bloody war, by the events of it." *Memoirs of a Cavalier* (1720), p. 308 (ed. 1840).

To return to the quotation from Milton above referred to, "It had been *advocated* and moved for by," etc., rendered familiar by Archdeacon Todd and Dr. Richardson, Dr. Murray assumes that its "for" has a twofold connexion. Dr. Worcester, being of a different mind, follows Archdeacon Todd in connecting the "for" with "moved" only, and in taking "advocated" to be, consequently, transitive. It may be that he is right in so doing; but he ought not to have garbled Milton, making him write, "It has been *advocated by*," etc.

For the verb transitive, as now current, Dr. Murray's earliest quotation is from Edmund Burke, and is dated "? 1767," in correction of which we are to read "1782." Yet Burke's use was not wholly unknown in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:

"Too inconsiderate headlong rashnesse this may be censured in me, in being thus prodigall in advantaging my adversaries; but my case is now smoothred secret, and, with light cost of rough cast rhetoricke, it may be tolerably playstered over, if, under the pardon and priviledge of incensed higher powers, it were lawfully indulgenst me freely to *advocate* my owne astrology." Thomas Nashe, *Lenten Stuffe* (1599), in the *Harleian Miscellany* (ed. 1808–1813), vol. vi., p. 146.

"Commest thou hither, fourthly, to *advocate* the cause of thy Clyent, who flyeth to thy learning, experience, and authority, for succour against his adversary, and commendeth his state and suit to thy care and trust?" Bp. Saunderson (1624), *Twelve Sermons* (1637), p. 175.

"It has been said that this word," namely, the *advocate* under consideration, "is an improvement on the English language, which has been discovered by the United States of North America, since their separation from Great Britain." So, perhaps about 1804, writes the Rev. Jonathan Boucher, who, however, does not particularize the person or persons by whom the opinion which he mentions was maintained, and, moreover,—though on wrong grounds, from mistaking the meaning of the older English and Scotch "*advocate* a cause,"—goes on to deny its tenability. Nevertheless, Archdeacon Todd, in 1814, at the same time that he misapprehends the signification of the phrase just cited, comments as follows on his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fellow-cleric: "Mr. Boucher has been misled in this literary concession which he has made to the Americans; for it is also an old English word, employed by one of our finest and most manly writers; and, if the Americans affect to plume themselves on *this pretended improvement of our language*, let them, as well as their abettors, withdraw the unfounded claim to discovery, in [*sic*] turning to the prose-writings of Milton." The disingenuousness of this is palpable, and so is its animus. For what "literary concession" has Mr. Boucher "made to the Americans"? And why should it be gratuitously intimated that "Americans affect to plume themselves," etc., especially since Archdeacon Todd might have informed himself that Dr. Franklin, thinking the verb *advocate* to be of American birth, condemned it in 1789? Besides this, the opinion recorded by Mr. Boucher was hardly a species of felony, or the like, that the epithet "abettors" should be applied to its upholders. Writing in 1816, Mr. John Pickering, while "not aware that the Americans did 'plume themselves' upon this word," *advocate*, pertinently observes that "they may justly claim the merit (if there is any in the case) of *reviving* it." Yet the Archdeacon, in 1827, saw fit to reproduce, without the slightest alteration, the passage which has here been animadverted on.

I would add that any one who enjoys access to a large library would satisfy a rational curiosity by producing anew, with dates attached, the quotations for the verb transitive *advocate* which are found in Mr. Pickering's *Vocabulary*, and in Dr. Webster's *Dictionary*, ed. 1848.

"Half the Anglo-Americans went over red-hot from the conventicle, the other half flagrant from Bridewell; the *tertium quid* was the roguery of the one side superinduced upon the hard vulgarity of the other." This summation of our forefathers, strictly accordant with orthodox British mythology, is from the pen of that highly imaginative Americanophobist, Robert Southey. And, as were, with him, our forefathers, so, by the logic of antipathy, were their descendants, down to the latest. No good was to originate from them. The English language, like everything else that they had to do with, they could only corrupt; and, among their supposed corruptions of it, the *advocate* which I am discussing is sneeringly introduced, by Southey, in one of his latest works, to exemplify, with the verb *test*, those greatly misunderstood phenomena, "Americanisms." Their demonstrated acceptableness was no counterpoise to the stigma of their fancied transatlantic nativity.

Inasmuch as Dr. Murray quotes, for this *advocate*, only a brace of authorities, Burke and William Taylor, prior to 1850, it seems worth while to show, by references to citations which I have at hand, that, throughout the greater part of the first half of our century, it was freely employed, and by writers of the highest respectability. Among such are, for instance, Coleridge (1800, 1818, 1824), Bentham (1807, 1821, 1823), Rev. Sydney Smith (1808, 1824), Lord Byron (1812), Bp. Bathurst (1812), Rev. G. S. Faber (1816, 1817, 1818, 1819, 1824, 1827), Thomas Love Peacock (1817), Rev. James Gilchrist (1817, 1826), Sir John Cam Hobhouse (1818), Rev. Thomas Belsham (1819), William Hazlitt (1819, 1825), Henry Matthews (1820), George Grote (1822), Rev. Dr. Christopher Wordsworth (1824), James Mill (1824), Albany W. Fonblanque (1825, 1827), John Stuart Mill (1825), Prof. H. H. Wilson (1827), Lord Macaulay (1829), Rev. Dr. Thomas Arnold (1829), Bp. Monk (1830), Rev. S. R. Maitland (1830), Rev. J. C. Hare (1832), Sir J. F. W. Herschel (1833), Bp. Thirlwall (1833, 1834), William Godwin (1834), Miss Harriet Martineau (1837), Bp. Samuel Wilberforce (1840), Rev. F. E. Paget (1842), Rev. William Palmer (1843), Rev. Dr. J. W. Donaldson (1847), Prof. F. W. Newman (1847), Cardinal Newman (1848).

Your obedient servant, F. H.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, December 10, 1891.

Notes.

THE third volume of Prof. McMaster's 'History of the United States' is issued by the Messrs. Appleton this week. It comes down to the beginning of the war of 1812.

Harper & Bros. have nearly ready two new novels, 'Mrs. Dines's Jewels,' by W. Clark Russell, and 'The Baroness,' by Frances Mary Peard.

Saxon & Co., London, will bring out in March an English edition of Félix Régamey's 'Japon Pratique,' an explanation of the Japanese modes of working in wood, metal, lacquer, porcelain, and stuffs, accompanied by more than 100 designs.

The new two-volume edition of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) is tasteful and handy, and may lay claim to the most truthful illustrations of the colored *dramatis personæ* yet made. These have been produced by Mr. E. W. Kemble, well known for his delineations of the negro race. They are mostly pen-drawings inserted in the text; but there are also more ambitious full-page wash-drawings, which as a whole, however, are not more successful. Mr. Kemble's art does not go much below the surface, and while he can imitate types, he cannot deal with character or passion. He has prudently confined himself mostly to his black subjects; his Eva is vague and disappointing enough. Perhaps a new edition does not demand a new portrait of the author, but we should be glad to see Richmond's absurdly idealized head of Mrs. Stowe permanently withdrawn from circulation.

A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, send us two more volumes in their comely series of "Laurel-Crowned Verse," viz., Tennyson's 'Idylls of the King' and Moore's 'Lalla Rookh.' The type employed in the 'Idylls' is small, but shows very clear in the excellent press-work.

The several papers on Ocean Steamships, since united in book form, are the main connecting link between vols. x. and xi. of *Scribner's Magazine*, which now lie bound on our table. Japan, too, has been a theme in both, with foretaste of Sir Edwin Arnold's 'Japonica.' For the rest we need hardly go over our monthly report, yet we will recall as among the more curious papers Prof. Dwight's on Right-handedness, and that illustrated with the highly interesting photographs from luminous objects.

Japan is also a topic in vol. xlii. of the *Century Magazine*, in the continued "artist's letters" of Mr. John La Farge. The Californian papers have gone on, and Mr. Kennan's Siberian have come to an end and are now before the public in another shape. The partnership between Mr. Cole and Mr. Stillman in illustrating the old masters is still undissolved. Most salient of the other features are the discussion of aerial navigation by Prof. Langley and Mr. Maxim, and Greeley's lecture (as it seems to have been) on Lincoln, to which we made reference last week.

It is not easy to summarize vol. xviii. of the *Overland Monthly*, but its distinction from our Eastern magazines lies in the attention which it properly bestows on Pacific Coast scenery and manners. Its "process" and other unpretentious illustrations are most abundant and most useful in this department.

The lasting value of the *Green Bag*, the "useless but entertaining magazine for lawyers" (Boston Book Co.), is as a biographical treasure-house. In the third volume the Supreme Courts of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Missouri, and Louisiana are treated historically, with the aid of numerous portraits; and there are besides sketches of James T. Brady, Lord Coleridge, Nathan Dane, D. D. Field, and many other legal luminaries both British and American. The list of portraits numbers 124. Mr. Irving Browne's rhymed and annotated statements of decisions are an unfailing source of amusement and instruction.

A tiny 'Abstract of New York State Laws Affecting the Rights and Property of Women,' compiled by Mrs. Mary L. Rice, has been prepared for the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Buffalo, N. Y., and may be had in any quantity at a low price by addressing the secretary of the Protective Committee, Mrs. Adelbert Moot, No. 25 Niagara Square.

Dr. Constantine Stauder, a London teacher of Latin by colloquial methods, has conceived the idea of a tract illustrating the ease with which the language may be thus acquired. It is called 'Post Prandium: Pleasantries in Colloquial Latin,' and consists principally of pictorial humors from the American comic journals with the legends translated into Latin. As space allows, a little Latin drill is thrown in. The effect is droll, and "head masters of schools" may well feel disposed to order copies of this unconventional aid in teaching Latin. The publishers are David Nutt, London, and Westermann, New York.

From Westermann & Co. we receive also the new *Almanach de Gotha* for 1892. The four portraits are of minor yet not unimportant personages—the Queen Dowager and Regent of Holland, the new Grand Duke and Duchess of Luxembourg, and Charles, Prince of Isenberg-Birstein; the selection of this group having been determined by the death of the King of Holland, William III. In the ceaseless overhauling of this ancient annual, what is to be particularly noticed this year is the extension of the information as to consulates. In addition to the names and stations of consuls-general and consuls, the places at which vice-consuls and consular agents are established are completely given. In bulk, the *Almanach* is larger than ever before.

'My Lady Legend,' by Albert Segerstedt (D. Lothrop Co.), is a pretty collection of Swedish fairy tales, which have been cleverly translated into English by Anna von Rydingsvärd. Many of the stories bear a more or less close resemblance to Hans Christian Andersen's wonder tales, while others remind one of the English and German folk tales. The author is possessed of a great deal of quiet humor, some of which is unavoidably lost in the translation. The binding of the book deserves special notice: the colors are those of the Swedish flag, blue and yellow; in the upper corner is the Swedish coat of arms, and, in the lower, that of the translator, presumably.

The first part of Salomonsen's 'Scandinavian Encyclopædia,' a preliminary notice of which was published in these columns last summer, appeared some weeks ago, and will after January be followed regularly by two parts every

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

month. This part contains forty-eight well-printed two-column pages of reading matter, and two large illustrations, together with a number of small woodcuts, taken, most of them, from Meyer's German work. All the articles are signed, and among the names are some of the best known specialists in Denmark and Norway. In many cases one subject is divided between two writers, the one a Dane, the other a Norwegian, as with usury (*Aager*). The treatment of the letter A is especially full and satisfactory, its several functions being discussed separately. Its linguistic consideration is by the distinguished dialectician, P. K. Thorsen, who has contributed several other phonetic articles. Of special value are the descriptions of Danish and Norwegian towns, two of the former being accompanied by large charts in black and red. Their separate treatment, however, from the historical and the geographical standpoint, is undesirable, leading as it does to frequent repetitions. Among the distinctively Scandinavian articles may be mentioned Dr. Verner Dahlerup's account of the Aarkirkeby font, with an excellent reproduction from Prof. Wimmer's recent work. The majority of the Swedish biographical sketches are by Dr. Blomberg of Stockholm. While for foreign readers the work derives its chief interest and value from the full treatment of Scandinavian subjects not otherwise accessible, it is not by any means confined to these, but furnishes the latest information in all branches of knowledge.

We heartily welcome an adaptation of Prof. Behaghel's 'Die Deutsche Sprache,' which has just been published by Dr. Emil Trechmann of the University of Sydney, under the title 'A Short Historical Grammar of the German Language' (Macmillan). Behaghel's book is known as the most successful attempt hitherto made to give in small compass and in popular form the results of modern philological study as applied to German. It consists of an "Allgemeiner Teil," containing a rapid sketch of the principal changes, both external and internal, of the language from the Pre-Teutonic down to the New High German Period, and a "Besonderer Teil," dealing systematically with the present aspect of the language as affected by the former stages of its development. It is impossible here to give any idea of the wealth of information which this little book contains. Suffice it to say that there could be no better guide to a proper understanding of the burning questions of modern philology, such as the laws of accentuation, the principles of phonetic changes, the influence of analogy, etc., than is offered in this modest primer. Dr. Trechmann's adaptation is in the main well done. The larger space given to examples and the constant reference to English forms and usages are most welcome. The index, which is also an addition, would be more of an improvement if it had been done less hastily. We confess not to see the reason why the chapter on the influence of foreign languages upon German has been transferred from the historical to the systematic part.

The 'D. K. E. Catalogue' (New York: Council Publishing Co.), an octavo volume of over 1,700 pages, gives a complete list of the chapters and members of the fraternity from its foundation in 1844 to the present time. There are 35 active chapters and over 4,000 living members. A succinct biography of each member is given from the time he entered the fraternity, and tables are added showing the collegiate institutions mentioned in the catalogue, and the present geographical distribution of the membership. The book is thus a contribution to the history of college men, and its value would have been increased by tables giving the occupations of the members after leaving college. The professional distribution of college-bred men is a statistical point of no little interest, on which light may be thrown by the various society catalogues. Another point which might be touched on in them is the character of the exercises in the various chapters.

The *Electrical Engineer* begins with the new year a serial narrative of the work of Joseph Henry, by his daughter, Mary Henry, with annotations by Franklin Leonard Pope. It will incidentally vindicate for our countryman the discovery of magneto-electricity associated with the name of Faraday.

The Chicago *Open Court* for December 24, 1891, gives a shadowy "process" cut of the new monument erected over the grave of Theodore Parker in Florence. In the same number Mr. Theodore Stanton, the leader in this pious work, relates the steps taken to bring it about.

Mr. P. G. Hamerton concludes in the December *Portfolio* his series of papers on the "Present State of the Fine Arts in France," the last being on Engraving. The general result, in his opinion, is, that there is no lack of vitality in French art, but that it is "in a condition of the most complete anarchy, and is no more a school, in the sense of any common purpose, than the business association of individual artists in England can constitute a school." Doubtless we shall meet with this survey again in a volume, provided, we hope, with more adequate illustrations than the *Portfolio* has indulged in.

The first number of *Natura ed Arte* (Milan: Francesco Vallardi) has come to hand since our recent announcement of it. The illustrations are of ordinary quality, without exception of the single photogravure—a portrait of the King of Italy, whose praises are sung by A. de Gubernatis. This is the first of "illustri contemporanei." Raffaello Barbiera has a paper on the writings of Cesare Correnti; a letter from Malibran furnishes another; science and art are not neglected. Of greatest worth, perhaps, are the departments called reviews of travels, of "economia" (the state of the country), of agriculture, and of books; the last especially being promising. There is a political chronicle, and even the fashions are recorded. All this in 80 quarto pages.

Dr. Hans Meyer contributes to *Petermann's Mitteilungen* the various observations taken on his last journey from Mombassa to Mt. Kilimandjaro and return, together with notes upon them and a map. This route, though frequently travelled by Europeans, has never before been carefully surveyed. An interesting list of geographical names in Central Asia, with their situations, derivations, and definitions, is given by H. Vámbéry. In the introduction to it he remarks on the great confusion occasioned by the substitution by the Russians of *g* for *h* and *a* for *o*, as well as by the often intentionally misleading information given by the natives. A supplemental number contains a description, both scientific and historical, of the famous Adam's Bridge, the series of bold cliffs and sand-banks lying between the island of Ceylon and India, believed by the natives to have been built in five days by the Vánars for the passage of Rama.

—The January *Atlantic* is a brilliant number on the literary side; but perhaps, all things considered, the most noteworthy article it contains is an unsigned survey of "The Political Situation." This is an admirably condensed analysis of the state of parties, and in particular of the historical place of the Republican party, and the disintegration it suffered when its mission was accomplished. The author expresses his sentiments very freely with respect to reform and the attitude of the party towards it—indeed, the frankness with which he thrusts forward tariff reform into the front of current issues is, under the circumstances, very significant of the progress of the principle in Massachusetts; but the whole paper is likewise stamped with the spirit of the independent voter in Massachusetts, and is a very complete expression of the political view taken by Republicans of the educated class who have practically left their party. The writer does not favor a new organization, and gives very sound reasons against it, but he suggests a union of those voters who favor the principles of reform for work in Congressional districts, in which, of course, the independent voter has the most weight. Outside of this contribution, the most unexpected article is one by Emerson on "Boston," the flavor of which is distinctly old-fashioned, and strikingly shows how far away the age of Emerson already is in literary feeling. Mr. Henry James writes sympathetically, of course, but almost too subtly, of Lowell; the tone is personal, but not intimate, and the period is naturally that of the English mission and the later London days. He dwells most on Lowell's literary and scholarly phase, and especially on his militant Americanism; but as he does not attempt a critical portrait, neither does he succeed in making one. Some of the correspondence of John Stuart Mill, and a poetical view of the Southern cause in the civil war, are the only other noticeable pieces.

—*Harper's*, though not without features of interest, on British Columbia, the Chicago Exposition, and the London of the Restoration, is freshest in the paper of De Vogüé on what he calls "The Neo-Christian Movement in France," in which he reviews the meditative works of some young Frenchmen on the ideas, social and religious, of the present time. He finds in their books a reaction from both the Voltairean and the Positivist spirit, and thinks that the somewhat mystical and pseudo-Christian impressions they have formed herald a new movement, of which the future is as interesting as the rise was unexpected. He traces the origin of this new feeling partly to the melancholy consequent on the last war, partly to the analysis of the revolutionary illusion begun by Taine, and partly to the confession by Tolstoi of his experience under the ideals and conditions of modern life. The movement marks the resurgence of the Gothic spirit in our civilization in distinction from the Roman element—the spirit of St. Vincent de Paul, of Mirabeau, of Saint-Simon, in opposition to the limiting and rational Latin genius, which, concurrently with the former, has formed the French nation. Whatever be the justice of the writer's observations, the facts which he points out are significant, and have an illustrative bearing upon the idealistic tendency in other parts of the world, now suffering a unification, both of sentiment and of idea, unparalleled since the Roman Empire. A literary paper is furnished by Horatio Bridge, who relates the story of the college days of Hawthorne, and adds some anecdotes of his friendships which, if they throw no new light upon his genius, are interesting in his singularly barren biography. The important announcement is made that the magazine will publish immediately Lowell's six lectures on the Elizabethan dramatists.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—The *Century* devotes much space to the Jews, in two articles, one upon the Jewish question in general, the other on the Jews of New York. Another public question is treated of under the head of "The Discontent of the Farmer," with much ability and also breadth of view. Witchcraft gives Dr. Buckley opportunity for another of his remarkable papers on the border-land of human belief. He may startle the reader by the statement that "witchcraft is at the present time believed in by a majority of the citizens of the United States," but he justifies the words; and his survey of the latest legal chapters in the history of the delusion is a most convincing illustration of the slow change of popular opinions. Quite the most important paper, however, is the account of Custer's last battle by Capt. Godfrey, who was with Reno's command; the thrilling story is once more told from the point of view of those who were nearest to the unseen battle, and it seems likely that we have now reached the fullest detail of the fight which no one lived to describe; and it would appear from this sketch, and the appended comment of Gen. Fry, that the charge that Custer disobeyed orders must be finally dismissed. The portraits of the officers who died, which are given, lend a pathos to the article which every reader will feel.

—*Scribner's* has travel-sketches of Egypt, Bokhara, and Bayreuth, together with a paper on "Paris Theatres and Concerts," which may be classed with them. A literary paper containing some of Allston's correspondence is principally noticeable for two characteristic letters of Coleridge. Recorder Smyth writes of "Crime and the Law," and makes certain suggestions for legislative change in the line of that philanthropic treatment of crime which, though it has been recently much disparaged, cannot but advance under such experienced and well-supported advice. The remainder of the number does not call for comment. In the March number, we are told, will be published the last poem written by Lowell, and the only one of consequence left in manuscript. It is "On a Bust of General Grant."

—The publication by M. Henri Doniol of the documents in the French archives relating to the Treaty of 1783 supplies the last important link in the chain of evidence; for the only source of information yet unexamined is the Spanish archives, and Spain was ever a drag upon the diplomacy of the day, rarely an active factor. The 300 quarto pages of Mr. Doniol are full of information on the acts and characters of those who framed the peace; but the most positive contribution for American history is to be found in the papers relating to Rayneval's journey to London in September, 1782. Adams had long wished to lessen the influence of France in American affairs, fearing merely a change of masters; and in Jay, soured by his fruitless stay in Spain, and holding the French representative as partially responsible for his failure, he found a ready follower. Indeed, Jay's suspicions of the French Court increased so rapidly that they soon outstripped those of Adams, and he found a full confirmation of them in the intercepted despatch of Marbois, and in the sudden and secret mission of Rayneval to London in an early stage of the negotiations. It is upon these suspicions that the controversy over the Treaty of 1783 has raged. In his letter to Livingston of November 17, 1782—a studied presentation of his position some months after the events—Jay conveyed his suspicions, and, on the objects of Rayneval's mission, he "conjectured" that the French agent was (1) to inform Shelburne that the demands of America to be treated by Britain as independent previous to a treaty (Jay's own demands), were not approved by the French Court; that an acknowledgment of independence in an article of the treaty would be sufficient; (2) to sound Shelburne on a division of the fisheries between Great Britain and France, to the exclusion of all other Powers; (3) to keep America from the Mississippi, and so divide the Western Territory north of the Ohio, and (4) to make such verbal overtures as might test the sincerity of the wish for a general peace. In any case Jay thought the interests of America were to be sacrificed.

—Franklin refused to entertain Jay's views; Livingston argued against them; Sparks gave good evidence against their probability, and Lecky and Bancroft scout them. M. Doniol, in his clear and usually impartial narrative, gives the final testimony. He prints in full the instructions given to Rayneval, drawn by Vergennes himself, which were intended to sound Shelburne's attitude upon a general pacification, and so covered the interests of France and her Continental allies, as well as of America. In the same work M. Doniol summarizes Rayneval's minutes of his conversations with Shelburne and Grantham; but in the *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique* he prints the minutes in full, comprising forty-six folio pages of MS. In the first interview, the complete independence of America was conceded, and without discussion; and in the two instances when the fisheries or boundaries were broached, the remarks were confined to the expression of a wish by Shelburne that the French King would not support the claims of the Americans, and a reply by Rayneval that the King would never give the weight of his authority to support unjust claims. Rayneval made one suggestion on the fisheries that might have figured in recent controversies, viz., that a simple rule for determining rights was to say that fish in the high sea was *res nullius;* off the coast, it belonged to the Power that held the coast. Apart from the few references to America that implied nothing but an interchange of individual opinions, given *officieusement*, the conversations related entirely to the East Indies, Africa, and the slave trade; Spain's demand for Gibraltar; Holland; and the suggested mediation by the courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg.

—Jay's suspicions, allowed free play by an attack of gout that rendered Franklin unable to take an active part, led to the completion of a treaty in such a manner as to give offence to France, assured Gibraltar to the English, and antagonized Spain. Further, the negotiations as conducted by Adams and Jay offer a curious commentary upon their mental processes. While denouncing France for secret methods, they completed and signed a treaty without communicating with their ally, in direct violation of their instructions, and with a secret article that might have renewed the war (for it was an insult to Spain), and that did prove an element of discord till the purchase of Louisiana. Franklin's tact and Vergennes's self-control and generosity smoothed over the matter. But when Adams and Jay are lauded as the makers of the Treaty of 1783, it will be well to recall that under it Adams could do little or nothing as Minister to St. James, and that in 1794 Jay himself was sent to negotiate a new treaty which should make good the defects of the old. As a diplomatic triumph the treaty was remarkable; but as a personal triumph it too strongly resembles the diplomatic "victories" of the man from Maine. In addition to the negotiations on the treaty, M. Doniol will make another valuable contribution to American history by printing the letters of Rochambeau.

—At the request of the family of the deceased Prof. Johannes Huber, the Munich publisher of 'Das Papstthum' (noticed in No. 1378 of the *Nation*) has issued a leaf to be substituted for pp. vii. and viii. of the preface of the present edition, stating with the greatest possible exactness the part taken by Prof. Huber in the collaboration of the first edition of the work. The original article, entitled "Der Papst and die Civiltà," which appeared in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* in March, 1869, Nos. 72–74, was written entirely by Döllinger. Huber proposed that this article should be enlarged and printed in the form of a pamphlet, and promised to aid in the revision. Döllinger accepted the suggestion, and in April Huber set to work alone, although under the constant supervision of Döllinger, who, however, a few weeks later, about Whitsuntide, again took his pen in hand and developed the projected pamphlet into the good-sized volume known as 'Janus,' which was finished towards the end of July. The work belongs, therefore, in conception wholly and in literary execution essentially to Döllinger, and it is perfectly just and proper that the title-page should bear his name only, although its "authors" are spoken of in the preface to the first edition, which appeared anonymously. We may add that of the papers originally printed in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, the concluding number, 74, which treated of the doctrine of Papal infallibility since the sixteenth century, was not embodied in 'Janus,' but has now been published as a separate essay in the volume of 'Kleinere Schriften,' pp. 405–425 (Stuttgart: Cotta). The defence of 'Janus' against the attacks of Cardinal Hergenröther was written by Huber, and not seen by Döllinger until published.

WINSOR'S COLUMBUS.

Christopher Columbus, and How He Received and Imparted the Spirit of Discovery. By Justin Winsor. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 8vo, pp. 674. 1891.

About half a century ago Carlyle, in his 'Past and Present,' apostrophized the discoverer of the New World in these glowing words: "Brave Sea-Captain, Norse Sea-King—Columbus, my hero, royalest Sea-King of all. . . . Thou shalt be a Great Man. Yes, my World-Soldier, . . . thou wilt have to be *greater* than the tumultuous, unmeasured world around thee." Irving and Prescott had already set the key-note to this pæan of praise, and in both worlds the consensus of opinion respecting Columbus had finally culminated in a strenuous, though hitherto ineffectual, effort on the part of a certain section of the Roman Catholic Church to bring about his canonization in recognition of his instrumentality in introducing Christianity into America. Some discordant notes, however, were heard amid this general chorus of commendation. With the progress of historical criticism, scholarly inquirers were found insisting that the portrait of the man had been drawn in altogether too high colors, and that it was essentially untrue. It was with some interest, therefore, that we looked for the conclusions upon this subject that had been reached by the last to enter upon this field of inquiry,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the scholarly librarian of Harvard, who has expanded the chapter upon "Columbus and His Discoveries," contained in his 'Narrative and Critical History of America,' into the comely volume now before us. We find Mr. Winsor decidedly ranging himself among the iconoclasts in his estimate of Columbus's character. The following is the portrait as he has painted it:

"Hardly a name in profane history is more august than his. Hardly another character in the world's record has made so little of its opportunities. His discovery was a blunder; his blunder was a new world; the New World is his monument! Its discoverer might have been its father; he proved to be its despoiler. He might have given its young days such a benignity as the world likes to associate with a maker; he left it a legacy of devastation and crime. He might have been an unselfish promoter of geographical science; he proved a rabid seeker for gold and a viceroyalty. He might have won converts to the fold of Christ by the kindness of his spirit; he gained the execrations of the good angels. He might, like Las Casas, have rebuked the fiendishness of his contemporaries; he set them an example of perverted belief. The triumph of Barcelona led down to the ignominy of Valladolid, with every step in the degradation palpable and resultant."

This will not be a popular position that our author has taken upon the threshold of the fourth centenary of the discovery of this continent, but we honor the courage which proclaims the convictions to which his unprejudiced investigations have conducted him. For our own part we believe that he is essentially correct in the opinion which he has formed in regard to the character of Columbus, and that this will be the final estimate in which he will be held by mankind.

Nor does Queen Isabella fare any better at our author's hands. He pronounces her to be "an unlovely woman at the best, an obstructor of Christian charity," and he quotes with approval Helps's statement that "there is hardly any great personage whose name and authority are found in connection with so much that is strikingly evil." He finds fault with Irving and Prescott for "making her confessors responsible for her acquiescence in the expulsion of the Jews and in the horrors of the Inquisition." The familiar story of her having offered to pawn her jewels to help defray the cost of the expedition, he agrees with Harrisse in regarding as a myth, since the exigencies of the war with the Moors had already required that sacrifice of her; and he thinks the advance of money was actually made by Santangel, from his private resources.

There will, doubtless, be a luxuriant crop of popular Columbus literature to welcome the commemoration of the great discovery—in fact, a brief sketch by the Rev. Edward E. Hale has already appeared at Chicago; but it will be hard, we think, to find a rival in thoroughness, scientific method, accuracy, and impartiality for the valuable monograph which Mr. Winsor has given to students of history. For it is to them that it specially addresses itself, although the general reader who wishes to discover what is the real truth about Columbus, need not find himself repelled even by the minute technical treatment of certain details, since this is always relieved by the vigorous and incisive style of the narrative.

Mr. Winsor does not profess to have discovered any new sources of information—indeed, this would seem to be almost impossible after the labor and research resulting in the long series of volumes upon Columbus that have come from the pen of M. Henri Harrisse, during the past twenty-five years. To these, and especially to his latest work, 'Christophe Colomb' (1884), ample acknowledgments are made for the stores of material therein contained, and it is clear that the present volume could never have been written without their help; but our author has displayed a truly independent spirit in drawing his conclusions, and in many regards he sharply criticises Harrisse's views. Nor would we be understood as intimating that he has depended upon Harrisse's labors only. The whole literature pertaining to the discovery of America is at his fingers' ends, and every source of information about it has been exhausted—embracing everything known or surmised that can be found in documentary or printed sources in regard to the origin, the birthplace, and the early life of Columbus, the growth of his ideas about the shape of the earth, and the grounds of his expectations of making further discoveries. All these are traced out to the farthest hint. Finally, in an appendix of 130 pages upon the "Geographical Results," Mr. Winsor has produced a masterly treatise upon the history of early cartography, in which branch of learning he is regarded as the leading authority. Every piece of testimony has been compared and sifted with untiring industry and practised skill, and the result is a model of faithful investigation into mooted questions and of clear setting forth of results attained.

Space will not admit of our dwelling upon the manner in which the familiar incidents of Columbus's life and the well-known facts of his different voyages have been handled, and we will confine ourselves to giving some account of our author's conclusions in regard to a few points, important or curious, about which there has been much discussion and great diversity of opinion.

There is a difference of at least twenty years between the various dates that have been assigned for the birth of Columbus, and some twenty or more towns or hamlets have contended for the glory of having been his birthplace. Mr. Winsor gives the names of all of these, with special details in regard to Savona and Calvi (in Corsica), but records his assent to the right of Genoa to the honor, in accordance with Columbus's own declaration in his will. His father, Domenico, a weaver, owned and lived at the house, still standing, No. 37 Vico Dritto Ponticello, and there, in all probability, Christopher was born, some time in the years 1445–'47, according to the conclusions of our author.

A chapter is devoted to the discussion of the question, "Was Columbus in the North?" as has been inferred from a statement to be found only in the life of Columbus by his illegitimate son, Ferdinand. Now, not only have the authenticity and trustworthiness of this biographical account been much questioned, of which only an Italian version is known, published in 1571, nearly a hundred years after the event, but the date assigned for the visit, 1477, is proved to be inconsistent with the known facts of Columbus's life, while the reference to the country visited is so vague and indefinite in regard to latitude as to be irreconcilable with what might be expected of an experienced navigator. But what renders the fact of an early voyage by Columbus to high northern latitudes highly improbable is that in 1492, when he was expatiating to his sovereigns upon the advantages of the harbors in the new islands he had discovered, he laid no claim for his ability to form a judgment regarding them to his ever having been farther north than England. So also, when the Spanish crown was contesting with his heirs his rights of discovery, no reference was made to these northern experiences, which would certainly have been cited in favor of the claims of the Crown. But even if he had made such a voyage as far as to Iceland, as has been so confidently asserted, it is only by inferences of a highly imaginative character that it can be supposed that he could have gained any information about the early voyages of the Northmen to Greenland and the American continent; and it is inconceivable that on his first voyage he should have laid his course southwest from the Canaries, if he had been prompted by information gained about lands lying in the northwest. Incidentally, Mr. Winsor is led to consider at some length the arguments in favor of the early Norse voyages to America, and his conclusion is that there is "no evidence beyond a strong probability that the Norse from Greenland crossed Davis' Straits and followed south the American coast." He scouts the attempts to identify the localities of their alleged sojourn, asserting that no archæological evidence of their presence here has ever been adduced.

All the world knows the thrilling narrative of that first voyage, as recorded in the abridgment of Columbus's journal preserved by Las Casas, but exactly where he made his landfall has been a very much debated question. The various opinions are all quoted and discussed, but our author allows that there "is just enough uncertainty and contradiction respecting the data and arguments applied in the solution of this question to render it probable that men will never quite agree upon which of the Bahamas it was." Three methods of identification have been followed: first, by plotting the outward track; second, by plotting the track between the landfall and Cuba, both forward and backward; third, by applying the descriptions given of the island first seen. San Salvador, or Cat Island, the most northerly of the group, was the one originally regarded as corresponding to what the discoverer called Guanahani. This was accepted by Irving on the authority of a careful study of the problem by Capt. Alexander Slidell Mackenzie of the United States Navy. The late Capt. G. V. Fox, Assistant Secretary of our Navy, after an elaborate survey and discussion of the question for the United States Coast Survey, decided in favor of Samana, and this conclusion has the qualified approval of Harrisse. But Mr. Winsor gives in his adhesion to the claim of Watling's Island, as best answering to the description and as supported by the weight of modern authority. Muñoz, Capt. Becher of the Royal Navy, Oscar Peschel, Navarrete, the late Mr. Major of the British Museum, and Clements R. Markham, are all of this opinion, which is sustained in a recent very elaborate study of the problem, in 1884, by Lieut. J. B. Murdoch of the United States Navy. A carefully drawn chart (after Ruge) is furnished, on which all the various courses suggested are laid down, with the different landfalls resulting from them.

Not until eighteen years after the great discovery do we find the first allusion made to it in English literature, in a translation, by Alexander Barclay, of Sebastian Brandt's 'Ship of Fools,' published in 1509. We will quote as a curiosity the uncouth lines referring to it, in which it will be noticed that no mention whatsoever is made of Columbus:

"For nowe of late hath large lande and grounde
Ben founde by maryners and crafty gouernours,
The whiche londes were neuer knowen nor founde
Before our tyme by our predecessours;
And hereafter shall by our successours
Parchaunce mo be founde, wherein men dwell
Of whome we never before this same harde tell.
Ferdinandus, that late was kynge of Spayne,
Of londe and people hath founde plenty and store,
Of whome the bydynge to us was uncertayne
No Christen men of them harde tell before."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What was the form in which Columbus originally communicated the intelligence of his success is one of the puzzles of bibliography. Several varieties of the text of a letter, in Spanish, making the announcement exist in manuscript, but no one of them is in his own handwriting, nor is it conceded that any preserves his exact language. One is addressed to Luis de Santangel, the Treasurer of Aragon, and another, essentially the same in its contents, to Gabriel Sanchez. Of the former an edition in small quarto was printed in 1493, but only one copy of it has ever been discovered. This was formerly preserved in the Ambrosian Library, at Milan, but it has disappeared from there. Recently the discovery of two other printed editions of this Santangel letter has been announced, each in a single copy, one in quarto, the other in folio. The quarto copy was sold in this city within the past year for $4,300, but Mr. Winsor remarks of it, "There can be scarce a doubt that it is a modern fabrication." The folio copy is said to be held by Mr. Quaritch, in London, at the price of £1,600. But what is commonly known and cited by scholars as "Columbus's First Letter" is a translation into Latin of the letter addressed to Sanchez, made by Leander de Cosco, probably at Barcelona, on April 29, 1493. Of this, within a twelvemonth, four editions were printed in Rome, three in Paris, and one in Antwerp. As to which of these little black-letter quartos or octavos is the *editio princeps* there has been an immense amount of learned discussion, and Mr. Winsor hesitates to pronounce judgment between them, saying: "There is just enough of uncertainty and obscurity as to date and printers to lure bibliographers and critics of typography into research and controversy, and hardly any two of them agree in assigning the same order of publication to the several issues." Of all these eight editions there are only about thirty copies known, of which some ten or more are in this country. The attention of the American public has of late been attracted to this literary rarity by the large prices that have recently been paid at public auction in this city for copies of different editions. These have ranged from the $4,300 given for the Spanish copy, as we have stated, to $2,900 paid at the Burton sale by the Boston Public Library for a copy of the Cosco Latin translation; and $1,500 paid at the sale of the Ives Collection for a copy of each of two different editions of the same text. As only five or six of the thirty copies known are ever likely to come upon the market, these prices cannot be considered as excessive. We have already called attention to the praiseworthy attempt of the Trustees of the Boston Public Library to popularize this interesting literary curiosity by publishing a handsome facsimile of their copy, with a translation, which can be purchased at a very moderate price.

Into the vexed question as to the present resting-place of the remains of Columbus, about which there exists a considerable body of controversial literature, Mr. Winsor does not enter at any great length. In 1541 the remains were transferred from Spain to Santo Domingo, shortly after the completion of the cathedral there, in which they were placed. The exact spot of the interment was not made matter of record at the time, and the traditional site in consequence has been drawn into dispute. When the Treaty of Basle gave the Santo Domingo end of the island to France, the Spanish authorities, in 1796, transferred the remains to Havana, with much pomp and ceremony. But in 1877, in making some repairs in the cathedral at Santo Domingo, certain discoveries induced the bishop of that see to claim that it was not the remains of Columbus, but of his son Diego, that had been removed. This has been denied by the Academy of History at Madrid, and accusations of fraudulent tampering with the inscriptions upon the box containing the relics have been brought against the bishop. Mr. Winsor expresses no decided opinion, contenting himself with saying: "The question has probably been thrown into the category of doubt, though the case as presented in favor of Santo Domingo has some recognizably weak points, which the advocates of the other side have made the most of, and to the satisfaction, perhaps, of the most careful inquirers."

The volume is most generously embellished with pictorial illustrations of every sort, but is especially rich in maps and portraits. It is even hospitable enough to allow space for the likeness, in a fifteenth-century costume, of Ptolemy, the illustrious Greek geographer and mathematician, of whom Prof. De Morgan says "we know absolutely nothing but his date, A. D. 139." Naturally a great liberality is displayed towards the portraits of Columbus himself, of which nine out of the sixteen upon Irving's list had been previously given in the 'Narrative and Critical History of America.' Seven of these are here reproduced, although our author confesses that there is "none that can be proved beyond question the result of any sitting or even of any acquaintance." None of them at all resembles the description of his person given by contemporaries. Our author expresses no preference for any, although he states that the so-called Yañez portrait as regarded by the late Duke of Veragua as the most authentic likeness of his ancestor. He makes no reference to the picture recently discovered in Venice, bearing the signature of Lorenzo Lotto, of which some account was given in the *Nation* of December 26, 1889. We should be pleased to have learned Mr. Winsor's opinion in regard to its genuineness and value, as it is said to resemble the Yañez portrait in many particulars, with some difference in the costume.

It would be agreeable to linger longer over numerous other interesting points treated by our author, but we refrain, simply commending most heartily to our readers this valuable and beautiful volume, upon which the publishers have lavished all the resources of their art.

BLADES'S PENTATEUCH OF PRINTING.

The Pentateuch of Printing, with a Chapter on Judges. By William Blades. With a Memoir of the Author and list of his works, by Talbot B. Reed. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1891. Demy 4to, pp. xxvii, 117.

To announce a new book by William Blades is to arrest the attention of every lover of old books. His 'William Caxton' of 1861 was a model of intelligent research and of candid criticism, in which nothing of value was left unsaid. Similar commendation must be given to many of his minor productions, but the book before us is a grave exception. Although beautifully printed, freely illustrated, and, despite its fanciful title, logically arranged, it gives no new information, nor does it present all the old facts that are really needed in an epitome of typographic history. We have "Genesis," the beginning of printing; "Exodus," the promulgation of the art of typography; "Leviticus," the rules or methods of the early printers; "Numbers," brief notices of some of the early masters; "Deuteronomy," a review of the typographical achievements of the nineteenth century; closing with the chapter on "Judges," which is an insufficient mention of the leading authorities. The plan is comprehensive enough, but it has not been fully developed, for Mr. Blades's death must have left much of the work undone. What we have is, as his editor admits, an incomplete work, possibly little more than the skeleton of the book intended. Mr. Reed assures us that he has not transcended the lawful line of the editor; only in minor matters has he filled the gaps which were needed to make the proper connections. The chief deviations are a short memoir of Blades, and a careful collection of his valuable contributions to periodicals. One lays down the book with a regret that the author had not been spared to give to it the thoroughness of treatment that characterized his previous works.

The object of the 'Pentateuch' is to present in a compact form the sifted evidences concerning the invention of printing. There is need of such a work. All the authoritative treatises on the subject are bulky, and many of them have much irrelevant matter; but the ordinary reader is most repelled by the uncritical spirit and general bad temper of the authors. With few exceptions the authors dispute more than explain. One-half of them maintain that typographic printing was first done in Holland, probably by Coster; the other half, that it was first done at Strassburg or Mentz, by Gutenberg. Protesting against the quarrelsome spirit of previous writers, Blades attempts to give "fair and impartial criticism, based on acknowledged facts and historical evidence."

Unfortunately, in a previous book he had avowed his belief in the priority of Dutch typography, but he was careful not to assent to the dubious legend of Coster as the inventor. His doubts were wise. In 1869 Dr. Van der Linde put this legend of Coster into a crucible of criticism and reduced it to ashes; but his needless gibes at the easy credulity of the Costerians made antagonists of many fair-minded believers in a probable priority of Dutch printing. Blades was of the number who took the higher ground that the legend of Coster was unimportant; that there were evidences enough without this story of a prior practice of printing in Holland. Dr. Hessels, the translator into English of the 'Haarlem Legend,' went further. He attacked Dr. Van der Linde and the documentary evidence on which some of the claims of Gutenberg are based, with great ability, but in a bitter and intolerant spirit, which makes the inquirer doubt his judicial competency.

In this book, Blades attempts to reconcile the disputants by the assumption that there were two schools of typography: (1) a Dutch school, that made rude types and printed petty books, which school was the outgrowth of a long-continued practice of block-printing in Holland; (2) a German school, that made good types and fully developed the ruder Dutch method. In support of this assumption he says there are "forty-seven different books, or fragments of books, printed with eight different fonts of type, all Dutch in origin, all without any name, date, or place, nearly all discovered in the bindings of manuscript or printed books, thirty-three of them on vellum and four of them printed on one side only. What can we do with this interesting regiment of incunabula? To make them later than, or even con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

temporaneous with, the earliest dated books seems impossible."

Why impossible? Two of these books allude to men and events of the years 1457 and 1458. Not one fragment has been found in any book bound before 1467. There is no direct evidence that they were made before the Bible of forty-two lines. The rudeness of these eight fonts of type is not good evidence of their priority. That they may have been made, as has been alleged, from punches of wood, matrices of lead, and moulds of sand, proves nothing as to their age, for these rude implements have been occasionally used by type-founders ever since for the making of large types. Didot says ('Essai sur la typographie,' p. 607) that he had used them, and his description of their use gives us the clearest and, indeed, the only acceptable explanation of their peculiar faults. One of the forty-seven books, probably the worst as to its type-founding—the 'Abecedarium'—shows typographic peculiarities which are unmistakably of the last quarter of the fifteenth century. So far from showing the earliest processes of typography, these books show its early degradation. They seem to be the work of a contemporary block-book printer who attempted an imitation of the good method of a master, from an imperfect knowledge of its processes, and with intent to evade its conditions and cheapen its tools.

Of direct historical evidence, Blades presents very little, for there is little to give. The story of early printing at Haarlem, which was first told in print in 1561, is hearsay and of small value. The earliest and clearest expert testimony concerning the invention is that of Ulric Zell, a printer, who gives this testimony in the 'Chronicle of Cologne' of 1499:

> "This highly valuable art was discovered first of all in Germany, at Mentz, and it took place about the year 1440, and from this time until the year 1450 the art and what is connected with it was being investigated. In this year 1450 they began to print, and the first book they printed was the Bible in Latin. . . . Although the art, as has been said, was discovered at Mentz (in the manner as it is now generally used), yet the first prefiguration was found in Holland, in the Donatuses which were printed there before that time. And from these Donatuses the beginning of the art was taken, and it was invented in a manner much more masterly and subtile, and became more and more ingenious. . . . The first inventor of printing was a citizen of Mentz, born at Strassburg, and named Junker Johan Gutenberg. There are some confident persons who say that books had been printed already before, but this is not true, for we find in no country were books printed at that time."—*Hessels's translation.*

The last and most important sentence is not quoted by Blades in the 'Pentateuch.' Van der Linde says that these suggestive Donatuses were xylographic; Blades says they were typographic. Is this of first importance? Is it not more important to know the nature of this new, masterly, and subtile invention which surpassed the Dutch method? It must have been something more than the copying of a rude method of making and using combined letters as types that moved Zell to call the new art a valuable invention. Even if it could be proved that the unknown printer of the forty-seven books made types before 1440, his priority would not materially affect the merit of the invention at Mentz. The unknown Dutch printer did not practise "the art as it is now used." He printed petty books only; he founded no school; he left no successor. His peculiar form of printing was barren as to results, and died with him. It did not have merit enough to attract disciples, nor vitality enough to live. The printing done in Holland after 1473 was done by the process and by the disciples of the Mentz school.

Hessels says that there is no positive proof that Gutenberg invented anything. It is not necessary here to consider this doubt as to the person. It is enough to say that "the art as it is now used" did appear for the first time, as Zell stated, at Mentz, about or soon after 1450, and that it produced great books of excellent workmanship. Blades says we know very little of the tools or processes of the Mentz printers. This is true. The writers who attempted to describe the new tools of type-making had to coin new words for new things, and the new words were not exact. Their descriptions might have been clearer, but they made no mistake in calling the new art a grand invention. They clearly understood, and some of them plainly said, that its great feature was the new art of type-making. Here it may be noted that the early method of type-making, so far as we know, has not been changed from that day to this. This first method was the only method: it was so thorough and scientific that no successor pretended to claim improvement.

The theory of Blades that typography as we have it was not an invention, but a gradual and imperceptible development at the hands of many experimenters, is a severe strain on the imagination. To accept this theory, we have to believe that one printer made types of wood and another of cut or cast metal; one man made a mould of sand, and another of brass; one used punches of wood, another matrices of lead; and so the work went on until it was proved by repeated experiment that the punch of steel, the matrix of copper, and the mould of brass or steel, were the proper implements. How these experiments could be made by many block printers or by searchers after typography before 1450 without leaving any trace behind them—how one man could appropriate the fruits of this labor and drive his predecessors or rivals out of the field and into oblivion—does not appear.

Blades is certainly reckless in his assertion that the believers in the invention at Mentz hold that the processes of typography as we have it came to the inventor by "sudden enlightenment." On the contrary, they accept the statement of Zell that the inventor "investigated" the problem for ten years. That he knew all the methods of contemporaneous block-printers and of other seekers after typography is probable, but it does not follow that he adopted their methods, or that he was largely indebted to them for his success.

Documents recently found in Avignon furnish a pointed illustration. They show that in 1444 one Procope Valdfoghel, a goldsmith of Prague, was teaching to eager pupils in that city a new method of "artificial writing." The mention of lead, tin, copper, iron, of "forms" (moulds), and of engraved letters, which were necessary for the production of this artificial writing, proves that Valdfoghel knew how to make movable types, but there is no evidence that he or his pupils did any practical work. His process, or his invention, if it may be so called, antedates that of Gutenberg, but what good did it do? It is possible that the inventor of printing at Mentz knew of Valdfoghel's methods, and perhaps of others equally unsuccessful; but it is not at all probable that the art which produced the Bible of forty-two lines came from a new combination of unsuccessful processes. It is much more reasonable to assume that, while the inventor thoroughly sifted the knowledge he acquired from others, he added to this knowledge more than he found.

RUSKIN'S ART TEACHING.

The Art Teaching of John Ruskin. By W. G. Collingwood, M.A., late scholar of University College, Oxford. London: Percival & Co.; New York: Macmillan.

NOTHING could well be more infelicitous than the idea of codifying the dicta of Mr. Ruskin into a system of art-teaching. He never taught art; he tried to teach drawing, and failed either to teach or to appreciate the supreme quality in drawing, and his own work never rose above the rank of earnest and patient amateur design, with a very incorrect eye both for color and form, though the feeling for both was very keen. We read his books for their poetic form of thought, their passionate love of nature, and the exalted humanitarian and spiritual aspiration running through them; for diction, for pathos, for philosophy, not always sound, but always sincere; and not least, for a pathetic personality which gives its tone to all he says on the most trivial subject. It would be difficult to say which of his definitions (rather, perhaps, appreciations) of art are the most or least accurate, for he gave expression to so many and so different that there are few views of art which he has not in one or another way taken at various times. But what may be said confidently, and what will be admitted as the general opinion of experts whose knowledge of the matter is most intimate, *i. e.*, the general body of artists of all nations, is that his doctrines, taken in the broadest comprehensiveness, are absolutely inapplicable to art. He has said numerous wise and witty things about art, and has shown a keen perception of certain forms of it, but the vital and essential qualities of it he never grasped. He continually confounded art with the uses of art, never got rid of the early misconception that it had some relation to religion or morality, or was secondary to nature; he invariably estimated artists primarily by their treatment of detail, which is only one, and not the most important, element in a work of art; and he set up his peculiar sympathies with it for the standard of dignity, if not of excellence. It is impossible to accept his notions of art as the basis of any system of teaching, for they lead to nothing but confusion or mindless representation of nature, which he again repudiates, though it is the most logical result of his precepts, and the only one his direct teaching ever developed.

But art is only the text of his preaching, and what he says is often in no relation to the text, nor the worse for not being. He was, Mr. Collingwood says, "intended for the Church," and he passed his life in the pulpit, if not in that of the Church. What the author has attempted to do is, then, the collecting of the texts which Ruskin set for himself to preach from, apparently ignorant that it is as an artist in words and not as a teacher of the graphic arts that Ruskin stands for us in the front rank of his contemporaries. His books will be as interesting when the arts they treat of are extinct; and the best proof that it is the eloquence and not the doctrine that gives him his place is that, when translated into another language, his ideas have never made their way. The bare statement of his doctrines which Mr. Collingwood gives, with the apparent conviction that he is putting forth a gospel of art, is sufficient to show us that Ruskin was not an art teacher. And even in drawing he never understood the secret of teaching what is most important for a young artist to know, the power and meaning of style, or the signification of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conventionalism in art—for all true art has its conventions, sometimes of the school, and sometimes of the individual; conventions of color, conventions of form, drawing, composition, and subject. When his 'Elements of Drawing' came out, we happened to show a copy to one of the best draughtsmen in America, and he returned it with the remark, "Ruskin should not have printed that; we know now what he does *not* know." No more futile book of instruction in drawing, we are inclined to say, was ever put forth. He seems, according to Mr. Collingwood, to have learned later its futility, but not the reasons of it. Nor does Mr. Collingwood understand it better. He says, for instance: "The conception of Ruskin as a mere literary stylist and dilettante in Art is an error; there are few writers whose opinions are founded on so thorough an examination of the subject"—a curious non-sequitur, as if the much studying a subject were any substitute for natural capacity to comprehend it, or an antidote for radical errors in the theory of the study of it. To say of Ruskin that he is a "mere literary stylist" is an exaggeration of what is to be said of him, but that he is a "dilettante in art" is no error, but the very fact. He delighted greatly, it is true; but more than a "dilettante," *i. e.*, an amateur, he never was or could have been.

The compiler is frank enough to admit that Ruskin changed his views of art as he grew older; the pity is that he had not waited for his views to ripen before he sent them out to the world; but Mr. Collingwood gives one passage with approval from the 'Aratra Pentelici' which must be taken as the matured and approved doctrine:

"All second-rate artists will tell you that the object of Fine Art is not resemblance, but some kind of abstraction more refined than reality. Put that out of your head at once. The object of the great Resemblant Arts is, and always has been, to resemble; and to resemble as closely as possible. It is the function of a good portrait to set the man before you in habit as he lived, and I would we had a few more that did so. It is the function of a good landscape to set the scene before you in its reality; to make you think, if it may be, the clouds are flying and the streams foaming. It is the function of the best sculptor—the true Dædalus—to make stillness look like breathing, and marble look like flesh."

It is difficult to concentrate more fallacy in so few words. Most second-rate artists follow Nature as closely as is possible, and the more closely their work resembles her, the more successful they are. They adhere to facts because they have no power of abstraction, and facts are very different from truth, which is what the greater artist aims at. No landscape painter the world ever saw, besides Turner, so little resembled nature, in the sense here implied, as he did; but probably none ever told so much truth. No statue looks so like breathing as a good piece of wax-work, than which nothing else is so far from art. The "Resemblant Art" is a pure assumption in nomenclature, meant to hide the incorrectness of the deduction and the inconsistency of the logic. The object of "Resemblant Art" is of course to resemble; the assumption that resemblant art is great art, or that there is any interdependence between the closeness of resemblance and the greatness of the art, even in a portrait, is utterly gratuitous—there is none. The greatest portrait-painter, as artist, is not the man whose portraits most resemble the original, as we see in every Academy exhibition. We recognize Titian as the greatest of portrait-painters, though we do not know whether or not one of his portraits was as like the original as one of Mr. Brown Jones Robinson who lives round the corner. A portrait that deceives you into believing that some one is looking at you out of the frame it is in, is always a vulgar piece of art, and is only possible as the work of a "second-rate" artist.

"There is, however," we are told, "a sort of art which does not thus deal with Facts; it is not necessarily imitative or representative, being occupied in the actual production of beautiful form and color; and this is Decorative or Abstract Art." Here again is pure fallacy; the art in this sort is the same as the art in the other, so far as it is art; it consists in the treatment of its material and the appeal which it makes to the mind. All art is decorative, but all art is not representative or imitative, and this multiplication of kinds of art only shows that Ruskin did not reach the central idea of art in his definitions or analyses, and that is the reason why he was continually making paradoxes and conflicting definitions. It is difficult to make a partial statement on the subject which we shall not find more or less indicated in some part of his works, and it is always possible to find in some other part a distinct contradiction of it; he gives nowhere the central truth by which we can reconcile his contradictions. Even in his nomenclature is continual fallacy, as when he talks of the rank of the arts—Symbolic, Imitative, Imaginative, etc., etc.; and Mr. Collingwood, in his attempts to reduce the Ruskinian system to a logical shape, only succeeds in making the matter more perplexing. Thus, he summarizes the idea of Ruskin in, "A great master is one who has great scholars, but Michaelangelo and Raphael, Titian, Veronese, and Tintoret entirely failed to teach their art"; therefore, they were not great masters. But a great master may chance not to find pupils able to follow him; does it follow that he is not a great master? The fact is, however, that Titian had several pupils who were admirable painters; Michaelangelo, one, Scalza, who was a very able sculptor; and if Giulio Romano was not to Mr. Ruskin's or our taste, he was a very powerful painter, who failed in sincerity, not in instruction.

Ruskin has said many things that are hardly to be denied; among these is the saying that "sound criticism of art is impossible to young men." But the book of all he has ever written which has produced the greatest effect on the public mind with relation to its art tendencies is the 'Modern Painters,' begun when he was twenty-two, and the later volumes of which, written years afterwards, have never produced a considerable modification of the judgments imposed by the first, which was that which established his position as a critic.

A reprint of Ruskin with the fine writing left out is a plum-pudding with no fruit, perplexing, contradictory, exasperating, and without a *raison d'être;* and this is Mr. Collingwood's 'Art Teaching of John Ruskin,' made worse by attempts to harmonize and make methodical that which in Ruskin was one of his highest fascinations for his reader—the wayward, capricious eloquence of erratic genius, astray in the garden of Nature, winged and free as *Ariel* after *Prospero's* wand was broken. To break him to common sense or rule is to put *Ariel* in harness; it cannot, fortunately, be done.

The Battle of Gettysburg, 1863. By Samuel Adams Drake. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Sq. 16mo, pp. 178.

Mr. Drake's effort has been to prepare a popular version of the story of the great battle of the first three days of July, 1863. He makes no reference to authorities, but tells the tale currently, fluently, with well-arranged grouping of incidents and with literary skill. The historical merit of the work must be gauged by the faithfulness with which the author adheres to the facts which are established by the concurrence of the best authorities. The greater the literary merit, the greater will be the mischief done to the truth of history if the facts are perverted. The besetting temptation in popular writing is to heighten color and contrast by making much of dramatic incidents. The stock anecdotes of history are notoriously unreliable, yet the weakest of them are reproduced in popular works with the regularity of stage "gags."

In all the larger elements of the story of Gettysburg, Mr. Drake's narrative is faithful to the accepted facts, and well combines a lively style with adherence to truth. There are some points, however, in which, by accepting a version ill supported, or by incorrect conclusions as to matters of conjecture, he has fallen into error, and, so far, given his assistance to building up mythical features in the history of the battle. He describes Lee as going in person to Ewell, on the evening of the 1st of July, to see if the latter, whose corps was the extreme left of the Confederate Army and enveloped Cemetery Hill, could not carry this important point. A long conversation is reported, in which the plan is debated, the discussion ending in Lee's deciding to make his attack next day by Longstreet's corps on the extreme right of the Confederates. Lee is represented as adding, "but he is so slow," speaking as if the admission were made in spite of himself.

We here are assisting at the growth of a myth. Lee did not visit Ewell at all that day or evening, and there was, of course, no such conversation. The reports of Lee and Ewell, the circumstantial account given by Longstreet, and that of Col. Long, who personally accompanied Lee as a member of his staff that afternoon, are the authoritative evidence on the subject, and they disprove the theory of such a meeting. Col. Long's memoir of Lee is not friendly to Longstreet, but gives no suggestion of any statement by Lee that Longstreet was generally "slow," but only that Lee was impatient on the 2d of July (the second day of the battle also) that Longstreet's corps did not get earlier into action. All that Lee is even then reported to have said means no more than Wellington's impatience at Blücher's delay at Waterloo. In each case nothing more was probably meant than that the delay was unfortunate, though the causes of it may have been inevitable. By the suggestion, however, that, in Lee's opinion, Longstreet was habitually slow, the reader is led to judge that a well-laid plan was thus foredoomed to disaster, and by inserting it in an imaginary conversation with Ewell on the preceding evening, an apparent definiteness is given to a dramatic incident likely to stick in the memory.

Another little touch which it is a pity to spoil is Lee's "shaking his clinched fist at Cemetery Hill," after the fighting of the second day was over, when he announced, in spite of Longstreet's remonstrances, his determination to assault again on the morrow, as was done in Pickett's fatal charge. The truth of history requires the correction that it was Lord Marmion who shook his fist at Tantallon's towers, and not Lee at imaginary ramparts in front of Meade's thin lines. Besides, it was not Lee's style.

To continue this ruthless erasure of pretty conceits, Longstreet is pictured, when giving

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the signal to Pickett to lead forward his division, as turning away under the mastery of his emotions after he gave the silent nod. Why not complete the scene, after the manner of Racine or Boileau, by making the tears stream through his fingers crossed upon his face? Longstreet, no doubt, says that he indicated his unwillingness to give the order by the silence of his signal, but he rode forward to a commanding point, where he might lose nothing of the sight, and, dismounting, sat on a fence watching every phase in the struggle, discussing it with Col. Freemantle, the English visitor, directing the movements of the artillery, and fulfilling his duties as responsible commander on that part of the field. The "turning away" is in the romantic style, but intelligent people are learning to like reality better.

On the national side Gen. Sickles is made the scapegoat. His occupation of the advanced line along the Emmittsburg road has been so often criticised that Mr. Drake cannot be blamed for taking the unfavorable view of it; but why blacken the shadows in the drawing by saying that "Yesterday he had not been able to convince himself that it would be right to move his corps out of line even that he might go to the aid of his immediate chief, and when his doing so would have saved the day"? Certainly, if there has been general assent to anything in the story of Gettysburg, it has been that Sickles on "yesterday" (the first day) had been preëminent above others for marching to the sound of the cannon without stickling as to technical orders. It is a queer inversion of justice when the man most free from blame on that score is the only one mentioned as faulty. The reason is a literary one. The picture will not be strong enough without it. As Longstreet's "slowness" was a trait to heighten the color there, so Sickles's "wavering" must be used here. Accumulating evidence has been reopening the question whether Sickles even erred in occupying the Emmittsburg road, as candid persons will be likely to admit who read the paper by Col. Rafferty in the lately published proceedings of the Loyal Legion.

It is a most wholesome thing in the literary progress of our time that moderation and self-restraint in historical writing are more and more demanded. The historian is called upon to tell what is known, not what is conjectured. He is required above all to be absolutely faithful to his materials, and to discriminate between those that are trustworthy and those that are not. If history, to be true, must be dull, the truth is still demanded, though there is a growing opinion that it will not be dull when the acts and motives of men in great epochs are so fully examined that we may make them live before us as real persons, with their own nature, and not some ideal one that does not fit them.

Egypt under the Pharaohs: A History derived entirely from the Monuments. By Heinrich Brugsch-Bey. A new edition condensed and thoroughly revised by M. Brodrick. With maps, plans, and illustrations. London: John Murray; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891. 8vo, pp. xxviii, 469.

THE chief advantage and improvement in the present form of this volume, apart from the reduced price, is in the fact that the amount of letter-press is one-half less than in the two-volume second edition of eleven years ago. The editor informs us that he has attempted to retain all the facts, but to tell the story in fewer words. Such condensation is commendable, and by no means difficult; but as some of the views of the original writer have been quietly suppressed and others substituted, we are necessarily left in some doubt as to the degree of authenticity which attaches to the book as a whole. There is no intimation that the condensation is in any way authorized. Upon the whole, however, the book thus far may be considered as an improvement upon its predecessors.

That for which Brugsch is best known in some minds is the theory of the route of the exodus which he has advocated, and which many suppose that he originated, though it was really propounded and published more than a generation before he was born. The identifications upon which this theory rested were set forth at length in the body of the 'History,' and the whole expanded in an appendix. Since Naville's excavations at Maskhutah, by which he identified Pithom, Succoth, and Heroöpolis, Brugsch and his followers have been compelled to abandon their former view. Consequently, the whole presentation of the subject should have been radically modified. But besides dropping the appendix referred to, the work of condensation has gone on in utter disregard of the new facts in the case. This is an extreme instance of the mechanical character of the work done by the editor.

Some additions of greater or less importance have been made to the volume. One of these is a list of the principal Egyptian kings with their cartouches. The addition is of value, but the effect of the hieroglyphic writing is far from pleasant, as it is in the solid black character made familiar in the dictionary which Birch furnished for the fifth volume of the English translation of Bunsen's 'Egypt's Place in Universal History.' The volume also contains some new maps. One of these, "Sketch Map of Dynasties," is a useful addition. The "Map of Lower Egypt" is inferior in execution to the old one in the former edition of the 'History,' while as an indication of our present knowledge of sites and localities in the Delta it is of little value on account of its composite character. It is made up in part from the old map and in part from the results of the excavations of Naville and Petrie under the auspices of the Egypt Exploration Fund. The result is a hodge-podge, self-contradictory, misleading, and in part untrue. The case is similar to that cited in the preceding paragraph. Disregarding the results of Naville's excavations, which established the *identity of location* of the cities there mentioned, we find Succoth indicated, as in the old map, just east of Tanis near the edge of Lake Menzaleh, and also, following Naville, at a point just west of Lake Timsah in the Wadi Tumilat, midway of the Isthmus. Heroöpolis, on the other hand, is placed a short distance northeast of Suez near the present head of the Red Sea, just as it was in the former map. In this Brugsch, without regard to the view now common and gaining in acceptance, that in early times the northerly extent of the sea was greater than at present, followed an erroneous interpretation of the words of Strabo, according to whom the western branch of the Red Sea was called the Gulf of Heroöpolis. Thus instead of correcting this blunder, the editor has simply perpetuated it. Similarly and most absurdly the Khetam or fortress of Succoth is located near Pelusium, just where Brugsch put it. The land of Goshen is pushed too far to the north and is on the wrong branch of the Nile. No notice is taken of Naukratis, though the discovery of its site is one of the most important of the past decade. There can be little wonder that it is found impossible to say much in praise of this singular piece of cartography. The editor has also added a list of the nomes, or districts, in which he gives the names in their Egyptian (transliterated) and Greek forms. In the former there are three gross errors in the use of a single letter, *t'* (pronounced *tz*, not *ch*, p. viii.), which is substituted for *th*. For this blunder Brugsch is not responsible. Tables giving the Egyptian calendar and a list of "values and prices" from about 1000 B. C. are reprinted from the old plates, but without the notes which the former editor deemed necessary. The index has also undergone a very vigorous condensation. In place of seventy-four columns we now have only twenty-six. Far more entries are necessary to make this part of the book satisfactory. One looks in vain for many points of interest, and even the names of some of the kings cannot be found.

The vice of the former edition is apparent in this also, in that we frequently find positive statements of geographical fact where it is impossible to go beyond conjecture. Exploration and excavation, the camera, the measuring tape, and diligent study of inscription and papyrus will all be needed for many a year to come, before we shall be in a position to state certainly for fact all that our author asserts most calmly and confidently.

The Use and Abuse of Money. By W. Cunningham, D.D. [University Extension Manuals.] Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891.

DR. CUNNINGHAM has an engaging style, and he has chosen an interesting subject. It is to be presumed, we suppose, from the series in which his book appears, that it is intended for somewhat uncultivated and immature minds, and it is therefore not proper to criticise it on account of its repetitions and restatements, since these may render it more easily assimilable. It is not all books, as Bacon assures us, that require to be "chewed and inwardly digested." But this reason does not seem to be of a kind to justify the introduction of a disquisition upon the "hypothetical" and the "empirical" methods in political economy. Dr. Cunningham complains that this science is based upon the assumption of the "facts of human nature and of the physical world," whereas the facts of human nature are continually changing. We need not dispute this assertion, but we do not find it easy to conceive a science of political economy that is not based upon the facts of human nature; and Dr. Cunningham encounters the same difficulty, for he immediately proceeds to give an investigation of these facts as an illustration of the "empirical" method. We cannot but regard it as unfortunate that he should not have explicitly referred to the fundamental truths relating to the method of social science so lucidly expounded by Mill in his 'Logic.'

Nor does it seem to us wise, as the aim of the book is primarily a moral one, to attempt to supersede the accepted use of the term capital. Dr. Cunningham adopts this course because he considers that "as we talk about it at the present day" a man's capital is understood to be a fund of wealth from which he expects to get an income. "This is what is meant by the word in ordinary conversation," he says, and at once proceeds to condemn the established definition on the ground that it may "suffice for popular talk," but must be discarded "if we wish for scientific accuracy." According to the author, it follows from this definition of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capital that it can exist only where money is generally known, that without habitual commerce and the use of a medium of exchange it cannot be formed, that it may be engaged in commerce or regularly employed for lending in lands where it is never used in connection with agriculture or industry, and that there are some societies in which there is no capital at all. It follows also, we may add, that a gambler who stakes his money on a turn of the cards is a capitalist. With reference to the origin of capital, Dr. Cunningham declares that the chief motive for saving is the desire to have a reserve fund, and that accumulation might continue unchecked even if the rate of interest were merely nominal. These propositions incline us to the opinion that the method of political economy employed by the author should be called rather conjectural than empirical, and we are confirmed in this opinion by the statements that agricultural communities have no roads or other means of communication, and that the farmer can by no means make the process of production more rapid.

In spite of defects like these, much that Dr. Cunningham has to say about capital is instructive and interesting. He argues calmly but forcibly against the views represented by Marx, and is extremely guarded in his judgments of the sins and omissions of capitalists. In fact, we have never seen a better exposition of the evils of regarding the motes in our brothers' eyes than is given in his chapter on social ideals. We may, he observes, frame our ideal for man in terms of his surroundings, or we may frame it in terms that concern him. To picture possible surroundings is simply to let the imagination run riot, for these surroundings, if once realized, could be maintained only by the diligence and self-restraint of men. Hence, ideals of personal character are the only practical ones, for the externals will be added unto these. Those who make their ideal an external one are prone to look for its realization not to their own action, but to that of others; whereas "if our ideal is framed in terms of personal motive, we shall begin by seeing that our own motives are right, and we shall be disinclined to waste our time in criticising the conduct of those who are in other circumstances than ours, and of whose motives and shortcomings we cannot judge." We cordially commend this volume to the consideration of those of our bishops and other clergy who have been led astray by the doctrine that Socialism and Christianity are the same thing.

My Personal Experiences in Equatorial Africa as Medical Officer of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition. By Thos. Heazle Parke. With map and numerous illustrations. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891. Pp. xxvii., 526, 8vo.

Mr. Stanley's choice of a medical officer for his last expedition was singularly fortunate. Surgeon Parke, though a young man, had already had much professional experience in Africa, having amid other duties served with distinction in the campaign against Arabi Pasha and in the Nile Expedition for the relief of Khartum. More valuable, possibly, than this experience, both to himself and his companions, was a temperament which enabled him to bear the greatest trials with equanimity and good humor. His journal, though full of the most painful details of sufferings, is strikingly free from complaints. A prey for months together to fever and inanition, living in huts swarming with vermin, and in close and constant contact with people of inconceivably repulsive habits and rotting away with disease, his cheerfulness never wholly forsakes him. To this sunny disposition was joined a remarkably self-sacrificing devotion to those under his care, according to their unanimous testimony, from Mr. Stanley himself to Emin Pasha, whose first conscious word after his well-nigh fatal fall at Bagamoyo was a call for "Parke."

The most interesting part of his work, which is mainly an unaltered transcript of his notebooks, is that relating to the experiences in the great forest. These are told far more vividly in his simple narrative, written from day to day, than in Mr. Stanley's labored description. Dr. Parke's is, in fact, the only account of the sufferings of the men at Ipoto and Fort Bodo, the most distressing episode in the history of the expedition, with the exception of that of the rear column. At the former place he was for three months the virtual prisoner of a band of the "cannibal slaves of slaves" of Arab slave-hunters. It would be difficult in all the annals of human suffering to surpass the horrors of this situation, the details of which are only too faithfully given in the diary. Here more than half of the Zanzibari carriers left with him perished from starvation, disease, and cannibalism, while he and his only white companion, Capt. Nelson, were brought again and again to the brink of the grave by their hardships. Only less dreadful were the six months spent at Fort Bodo waiting for the arrival of the rear column, where the forced inaction was not the least of the trials of which fever, hunger, and filthy surroundings were the chief elements.

Apart from his record of these wretched days and of his professional attempts to alleviate the misery of his companions, Dr. Parke's book contains little worthy of especial note. He carefully avoids entering into any of the controversies aroused by 'In Darkest Africa,' though he is in substantial accord with Mr. Stanley in all important points. There are comparatively few references to native life and customs, or to the natural history of the country traversed. The individuals, however, with whom he had personally to do, are often well described. Especially interesting is his account of the pigmy woman whose freedom he bought "for a handful of beans, twelve cups of rice, and six cups of corn," and who served him for more than a year with the greatest devotion, both as a nurse in his frequent fevers and as a food-provider in the forest. Emin Pasha is precisely the same interesting, though inexplicable and trying, personage with whom Stanley and Jephson have made us familiar, a strange mixture of strength and weakness, but singularly winning withal. The most striking figure is, of course, Mr. Stanley himself, and Dr. Parke gives in some respects a stronger impression of his wonderful capacity as a leader than any previous writer. In his closing pages he pays a remarkable tribute to him, evidently sincere and frankly truthful, which we regret that we have not the space to quote in full.

There are numerous little graphic touches in the journal which lighten its somewhat monotonous and often dismal record of hardships, and not a few fine descriptive passages, as for instance the account of the arrival of the rear column at Fort Bodo and the execution of the deserter Rehan. The special contributions to science consist of accounts of the various diseases from which the expedition suffered, and their treatment, and chapters on bacteriology and the arrow-poison of the dwarfs, the ingredients of which were revealed to him by his pigmy attendant. The illustrations of the volume are rather poor, with some few exceptions, such as the two charming sketches of children by Mrs. Stanley.

The Lily of the Arno; or, Florence, Past and Present. By Virginia W. Johnson. Boston: Estes & Lauriat.

"The world does not require so much to be informed as to be reminded," is the motto Miss Virginia Johnson has chosen for her 'Lily of the Arno,' and she seems to have very faithfully adhered to her text by giving her work the form of a personal narrative of impressions received during a sufficiently long stay in Florence. Those who have carried away bright memories of the City of Flowers will find much to charm them in the handsome volume bearing the scarlet Florentine lily on its face. It is full of vivid descriptions of living, moving Florentines of to-day at their work and at their play, of their feast days and fast days. Most of these impressionist pictures are seen by our author from her window in the street of the watermelon (del Cocomero), now called Via Ricasoli, leading from the Piazza of St. Mark to the Cathedral. The window is situated, therefore, in a closely populated part of the city, from which characteristic habits of neighbors can be observed—the vegetable woman across the way, the vender of wood and charcoal occupying a cellar in the palace wall, the dealer in old books in a small shop beyond, and an antiquarian opposite. These neighbors, with their belongings, serve to give local color and to illustrate the manner of life of the poorer classes, their children, their cats and other tame pets.

With genuine enthusiasm for the past, Miss Johnson's days are spent in churches, galleries, museums. She never fails to blend with her descriptions of works of art or ancient monuments their histories, the anecdotes or romances connected with them. Vasari seems to be the source of information from which she has chiefly drawn her lives of the Florentine artists, for she repeats many of the tales about them long ago shown to be fables—for instance, that of Fra Filippo Lippi and the abduction of the nun Spinetta Buti, considered by modern critics a base calumny; or again, what she says of Botticelli, that he left off painting after the burning of Savonarola, and would have starved in old age but for the bounty of the Medici. These inaccuracies are hardly pardonable even in a work which simply skims history, biography, romance, and legend as they concern the subject written of. Moreover, throughout these pages there is a painful lack of clearness of style: the book abounds in passages of incoherent and overloaded diction, as in the case of the Campanile of Giotto:

"To the more modest artistic tourist, red guide-book in hand, this revelation of the beautiful must ever be the wayside sacrament of Canon Kingsley, to be treasured in remembrance for the remainder of life; sharing the reveries of the pipe in some tranquil German town; gleaming swiftly in a displaced photograph on the table during the long winter night of Scandinavia; checking for a moment the rapid current of Western life, as if a spray of Dante's purple black lilies were held across the path of the American in guise of magician's wand."

There is an abuse of "fine writing" throughout—an accumulation of adjectives, a wearisome repetition of questions never meant to be answered. It is as if the author had jotted down all her thoughts in a note-book and had translated them, without any particular order or method, into the most involved language the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English tongue is capable of. Speaking of ancient customs still prevalent (page 17), Miss Johnson says:

"Does the father and bread-winner of the family sicken of fever in the autumn, imbibed from the mouldy well of the court adjacent to his cobbler's stall, or the son, an apprentice to the trade of mosaic-worker, whose nights are devoted to strolling about the streets, twanging guitar and mandolin, in company with other youth, and slender, sallow daughter, clad in flimsy gown for the Sunday walk along the Arno bank to the cascine in the piercing *tramontane* wind, suffer a lung congestion—the frequent *mal di petto?* There is the hospital ready to receive them, founded by worthy Folco Portinari, father of Dante's Beatrice, at the suggestion of his servant, Monna Tessa, whose presence in ward and cloister seems to still smile benevolently on each new comer to her precincts."

There is much repetition. The book would have gained had it been judiciously pruned. It struck us that cats had been continually turning up in every part of the book, and we find on consulting the index that they have been written of no less than fifteen times. The illustrations of the chief buildings throughout the work are in collotype.

One Summer in Hawaii. By Helen Mather. 12mo. Cassell Publishing Co. 1891.

THE fascination of Hawaii for tourists is pretty well proved by the long sequence of books which describe the wanderings of pleasure-seekers and of commercial or scientific tourists who have set foot of recent years upon those pleasant shores. The present volume is the latest recital of a leisurely traveller who was advised to "take a run down to the islands," and thought the trip would be like going down from New York to Coney Island; but whose good intentions were not dashed by learning that one had to "run down" two thousand miles into the Pacific to be landed at Honolulu. Mrs. Mather's trip, made during the summer of 1890, included visits to the islands of Oahu and the capital, Honolulu; to Maui and its great extinct crater of Haleakala; and on Hawaii, an island as large as the State of Connecticut, to the active crater of Kilauea, and to the beautiful bay and village of Hilo.

This ground our writer covers with steps that may be followed with ease and pleasure; and her record has fewer errors in the drawing than is usual in a summer tourist's book. We note one inaccurate description—that of the surf-players who ride in upon the front of the billows; and the cut that accompanies the text is equally misleading. But the descriptions of Honolulu and of the Pali are especially vivid; and many pleasant glimpses are given of the late King, Kalakaua, with whom Mrs. Mather exchanged courtesies. The most amusing thing in the book is the account of a practical joke which Kalakaua played, in a lighter mood, upon one of his guests. The visitor was gambolling in the surf at Waikiki, quite in the South-Sea fashion, with a group of Hawaiian nymphs, when the King struck despair to his heart by sending him word of the sudden arrival upon the scene of his wife. A figure, fierce as Megæra, appeared upon a distant balcony; Kalakaua hurried away to act as peacemaker; and after a particularly *mauvais quart d'heure* of suspense, the jealous wife on the balcony turned out to be a stuffed dummy, prepared to personate the indignant spouse. The story has a pleasantly recognizable note for those who were acquainted with the genial King; for Kalakaua was a laughter-loving as well as a capable sovereign.

Mrs. Mather has illustrated her very readable volume with vignette woodcuts and with "process" photographs, which give some idea of the exquisite beauty of town and country in these islands. The book is handsomely printed, and the typographical errors are at a minimum. The whole forms a bright picture of Hawaii as it is to-day, and of its rapidly changing and developing society. The author calls attention to a fact that is too little borne in mind by seekers for health or pleasure. The Hawaiian climate is sub-tropical, not torrid. The islands, bathed in an ocean current that never varies much from 70° Fahrenheit, are wholly exempt from excessive heat and from violent winds. For the combined attractions of climate, scenery, and good society, it would be hard to name another region, in the tropics or out of them, that should outdo this paradise of temperate sunshine.

The New World and the New Book: An Address delivered before the Nineteenth Century Club of New York City, January 15, 1891; with kindred essays. By Thomas Wentworth Higginson. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1891.

THE kinship which binds these essays together must be sought for in the declaration of our independence. The various papers make a chapter in our glorification. Their burden is that we are no longer colonial, and have long ceased to be so, though we are slow in recognizing the fact. This text is illustrated with much interesting information and spirited comment. There is hardly any phase of the long-vexed proposition which one does not come upon first or last in these pages, and that American must be deeply tinged with the English drop in his blood who does not end their perusal with a feeling of satisfaction, not to say complacency, which does not suffer, however, if it be touched with something akin to humor. It would appear, to adopt the author's simile, that Robinson Crusoe has pretty well furnished himself from the "wreck," and is now in a position to apply to the Old World the remedy for its ills which Carlyle once suggested for the unhappy state of Ireland. The only use which the author seems to find for Europe is to furnish delegates for that Congress of the world's literature which, in his judgment, should still hold in its hands the final verdict of excellence; but, on the other hand, this Congress seems to exist only that America should have a place in it. Whether these things are so will, of course, still continue to be questioned, but whoever would furnish himself with happy instances, brilliant paradox, clever flank movements, and similar resources of the controversial conversationalist, will find Col. Higginson's book an arsenal all in perfect condition for immediate warfare on the Anglomaniac who is unfortunate enough to encounter him.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adam, James. The Nuptial Number of Plato; its Solution and Significance. London: C. J. Clay & Sons: New York; Macmillan. $1.10.

Allen, Grant. The Duchess of Powysland. Boston: Benj. R. Tucker. 35 cents.

Almanach de Gotha, 1892. Gotha: Justus Perthes; New York: B. Westermann & Co.

Browning, Oscar. Dante: His Life and Writings. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan. 90 cents.

Browning, Oscar. Goethe: His Life and Writings. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.: New York Macmillan. 90 cents.

Byars, W. M. The Tempting of the King. St. Louis C. W. Alban & Co.

Carus, Paul. Homilies of Science. Chicago: The *Open Court* Publishing Co. $1.50.

Castlemon, H. True to His Colors. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates.

Chambers's Encyclopædia. New ed. Vol. VIII, Peasant to Roumilia. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

Clarke, Rev. J. F. The Lord's Prayer: Last Eight Discourses. Boston: American Unitarian Association.

Collins, J. C. The Study of English Literature. Macmillan & Co. $1.

Cunningham, Sir H. S. Earl Canning. [Rulers of India.] Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 60 cents.

Dobson, Austin. Goldsmith's Citizen of the World. [The Temple Library.] 2 vols. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $4.

Florence, W. J. The Gentleman's Hand-Book on Poker. George Routledge & Sons.

Ford, W. C. The Writings of George Washington. Vol. XII, 1790—1794. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Gordon, H. L. The Feast of the Virgins, and Other Poems. Chicago: Laird & Lee. $1.50.

Graham, P. A. Nature in Books: Some Studies in Biography. London: Methuen & Co.

Gunsaulus, Rev. F. W. Phidias, and Other Poems. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. $1.25.

Habberton, John. The Chautauquans. Robert Bonner's Sons. $1.25.

Hervey, M. H. Dark Days in Chile: An Account of the Revolution of 1891. London: Edward Arnold; New York: Macmillan. $3.

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.,

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED:

Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader. 12mo, pp. 384. Teachers' price, $2.00; by mail, $2.11.

Contains graded texts, from the easiest to the more difficult prose, with several suitable poems, all carefully edited and annotated. The poems are supplemented by a chapter on versification. The glossary defines all the words in the texts, furnishes much grammatical information, and gives etymological hints.

Whitney's Introductory French Reader. 16mo, pp. 245. Teachers' price, 65 cents; by mail, 71 cents.

All the matter is easy enough to present no unnecessary obstacle to rapid reading, interesting enough to hold the attention, and varied enough to serve as an introduction to any reading that will be apt to follow. The selections are all from authors of repute. There are ample notes, including grammatical references, and a handy vocabulary.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell bills of exchange on and make Cable Transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies; also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,

NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

ARTISTIC PRESENTS of PERMANENT VALUE.

Fine Pictures at Moderate Prices

HIGH-CLASS

Etchings, Engravings, and Water Colors.

FREDERICK KEPPEL & CO., PARIS, and 20 East 16th St., between Union Square and Fifth Ave.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

254 Fifth Ave., between 28th and 29th Sts., New York. Importer of Foreign Books. Agent for the leading Paris Publishers, Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. A large assortment always on hand, and new books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

UNITARIAN PUBLICATIONS

SENT FREE.

Address Box 462, Concord, Mass.

Paper, 30c. **Our Country** Cloth, 60c.

The greatest book of the century on America.

140th Thousand. Revised edition, based on the Census of 1890, and the first general application of its revelations to the great questions of the day. All booksellers, and mailed postpaid on receipt of the price by

The Baker & Taylor Co., 740 B'way, N. Y.

STUDY AND TRAVEL.

Mrs. Benj. Fuller Smith announces that she will continue to receive into her family in Dresden, Germany, a limited number of young ladies desiring to study abroad.

Mrs. Smith travels with her party during the summer months and holidays.

Information concerning expenses furnished upon application. Trustworthy references given and required. Address MRS. BENJ. FULLER SMITH. Care Messrs. Thode & Co., Bankers, Dresden.

Foreign Books. Subscription to foreign periodicals, Tauchnitz British Authors. Catalogues on application. CARL SCHOENHOF, 144 Tremont St., Boston.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED